Imprimatur,

Apr. 14. 1692. Jo. Cant.

Imprimatur,

Apr. 14. 1692. Jo. Cant.

47 F. 12. 27

AN

ANSWER

To a BOOK,

Spread abroad by the *Romiſh* Prieſts,

INTITULED, THE

Touchſtone

OF THE

Reformed Goſpel.

WHEREIN

The True DOCTRINE of the CHURCH of *ENGLAND*, and many Texts of the HOLY SCRIPTURE are faithfully Explained.

By the Right Reverend Father in God,

SYMON, Lord Biſhop of ELY.

LONDON:

Printed for *R. Chiſwell*, at the *Roſe and Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard. 1692.

380:03

TO THE READER.

I *Muſt let the Reader underſtand, that the Book which I anſwer, firſt appeared in the latter end of the Reign of King* James I. *under the Name of* A Gagg for the New Goſpel. *When it was immediately ſo expoſed to the Scorn of all Men, by Mr.* R. Mountague, (*afterward Biſhop of* Chicheſter, *and at laſt of* Norwich) *that for many Years it ſculkt, and durſt not ſhow its head, till they imagined that Baffle was forgot; and then out it came again, in the Reign of King* Charles II. *as if it had never been ſeen before, with this New Title,* The Touch-Stone of the Reformed Goſpel: *And the better to diſguiſe the Cheat, they begin the Book with a New* Chapter (*or* Section) *and have quite*

left out that which was formerly the Last Chapter; *transposing also the order of some of the rest; making Amendments, as they imagine, in several places, and adding several whole Chapters. For there were but* XLVII. *Points, (one of which, as I said, they now have wholly omitted) which they charged upon us, and undertook to confute in the First Edition: But now they are improved to* Two and Fifty; *and set out as formerly, with a long Preface, of the very same Stamp with the Book; full, that is, of broad-fac'd Untruths.*

Of which it may be expected, I should here give some account: But my Answer to the Book it self is grown so much bigger than I designed, that it must be omitted. For the great Reason which was urged by those who had power to persuade me to undertake a New Answer *to it, was; because Bishop* Mountagu's *was so large, that few could purchase it. And therefore they thought it needful there should be a more Compendious Confutation of the Book, though now it*

be

be inlarged: eſpecially ſince they found it in every Pariſh of this great City, and in the very Priſons, where the Romiſh-Prieſts could meet with any entertainment.

For which Reaſon, the ſame Perſons have perſuaded me, that what I compoſed, at their deſire, in the latter end of the late Reign, ought now to be publiſhed, becauſe the Prieſts of that Church, they aſſure me, are ſtill very buſie; and make account this little Book, which I anſwer, will do their buſineſs: For they put it into the hands of all thoſe whom they hope to make their Proſelites; and deſire them to read it, as an unanſwerable Piece.

Let the Reader judge of that, when he hath ſeriouſly conſidered what I have ſaid, to diſcover both the weakneſs *and the* diſhoneſty *of its Author: Who underſtood neither the* Scriptures, *nor* Fathers *he quotes; or hath ſo perverted them, that as it coſt me more time, ſo I have been forced to uſe more*

Words than I intended to employ, to represent his unskilful, or false dealing. But I hope I shall neither tire the Reader, nor entertain him unprofitably; but increase his Knowledge, by a right understanding of a considerable part of the Bible, and of the Christian Doctrine. Especially if he will be pleased to turn to the Texts *of Scripture; which I have explained, but not quoted at length, for fear of swelling this Answer into too great a Bulk.*

Febr. 22.
1690.

AN

AN ANSWER TO THE TOUCHSTONE OF The Reformed Goſpel.

I.

The Proteſtants, he ſaith, affirm, *That there is not in the Church* One, *and that an* Infallible Rule, *for underſtanding the Holy Scriptures, and conſerving Unity in matters of Faith.*

Anſwer.

THIS Propoſition is drawn up deceitfully. For neither *we* maintain this, nor *they* maintain the contrary *univerſally*, and without limitation. No *Papiſt* dare ſay there is *one*, and that an *Infal-*

Infallible Rule, for understanding *all* the Holy Scripture. For then, why have we not an infallible Comment upon the whole Bible? Why do their Doctors disagree in the interpretation of a thousand places? He ought therefore to have said, that we hold, *There is not in the Church one, and that an infallible Rule for understanding as much as is necessary to Salvation*, &c. And then he belies us: For we believe the Scripture it self gives us infallible Directions for the understanding of its sense, in all things necessary: which if all would follow, there would be Unity in matters of *necessary belief*. But God will not force men to follow those Directions. They may err; and they may quarrel, when they have an *infallible Rule* to prevent both.

The Scriptures therefore, whereby he proves what he charges upon us, must needs be impertinent. But it is something strange, that in the very *first* of them he should be so senseless, as to give himself the lye. For he pretends to refute our errors, as his words are, by the *express* words of our own Bibles, and immediately puts in a word of his own, instead of that in our Bibles; which say quite another thing. For instead of, *according to the proportion of faith*, (which are the words of our Translation

ſation XII. *Rom.* 6.) He ſays, *according to the rule of faith.* What is this, but that *chopping and changing*, which he falſly charges us withall, in the end of his Preface? And it is a change not only of the *words* of our Bible, (which he promiſed to quote *expreſly*) but of the *ſenſe* of that Scripture; as it is expounded by the ancient Doctors: particularly St. *Chryſoſtom* and his Followers; who by *proportion* underſtand the ſame with *Meaſure* in the foregoing v. 3. And thus *Menochius*, one of their own Interpreters, and a *Jeſuit*, [ſecundum proportionem & menſuram Fidei], i. e. *according to the meaſure of Underſtanding and Wiſdom which God hath beſtowed.* XII. Rom. 6.

Now what can you expect from a man who falſifies in this manner, at the very firſt daſh? In the next Scripture, indeed, he finds the word *Rule*, (III. *Philip.* 16.) and preſently imagines it is a Rule for the Interpreting of Scripture infallibly, *&c.* Whereas it is manifeſt to all who are not blinded with Prejudice, that the Apoſtle ſuppoſes in the words before, v. 15. they were not all of a mind in ſome things, for there were thoſe among them that believed in Chriſt, who thought the obſervation of *Moſes*'s Law to be neceſſary alſo to Salvation; which was a dangerous error, III. Phil. 16.

error, to mix Legal and Evangelical things together, as *Theodoret* here expounds it; but might possibly be cured, if Christian Communion were not broken on either side, by reason of this difference: but every one, both the *perfect*, who understood their Freedom from the obligation of that Law, and the *imperfect*, who fancied it still lay upon them, *walked by the same rule*, &c. that is, preserved Christian Communion one with another, in the bond of Peace. For he speaks here, saith *Theodoret*, of concord; and the *Rule* is, the Evangelical Preaching or Doctrine: by which if we walk't, it would help to procure agreement in matters of Faith. But they of the Church of *Rome* are so far from this, that they have broken all Communion, by their Tyrannical impositions, and making other rules besides the Evangelical Doctrine.

VI. Gal. 16. The next place evidently speaks of the self-same thing; that there is no necessity of being Circumcised and observing the Law; but if we be regenerated by the Christian Faith, we are sure of the Divine Favour. In short, the *Rule* here spoken of, is that of the *New Creature*, mentioned in the foregoing words, *v.* 15.

But

But the 4*th* Text, more fully ſhews this man to be a meer Trifler with words, without their ſenſe. For in 2 *Cor.* X. 15. There is not a Syllable of the *Rule*, or line of *Faith*, as he dreams: but only of the bounds and limits of thoſe Countrys, in which the Apoſtle had preach'd the Goſpel, as *Menochius* himſelf interprets it. This he might have learnt, if he had pleaſed, by the very next words, where the Apoſtle ſaith, he did not *boaſt in another man's line*, or rule, *of things made ready to his hand: i. e.* thoſe Countreys and Provinces which had been cultivated by other Apoſtles; glorying (as *Menochius* well gloſſes) in other mens Labours, as if they had been his own. Now this is a pretty *infallible Rule* of interpreting Scriptures, by the Regions in which the Apoſtles preached. An excellent proof, that there is *one Rule* of interpreting Scripture, becauſe St. *Paul* had his *own Rule*, and others had *their Rule:* that is, not one and the ſame; for he took care not to preach the Goſpel in *another man's line*; *i. e.* in thoſe places where others had done it already. Are theſe *Romiſh* Emiſſaries in their wits, when they write on this faſhion? Either they have no underſtanding of what they write; or hope their Writings will fall into the hands of Readers 2 Cor. X. 15.

ders, who understand nothing; else they would be ashamed of such wretched stuff.

1 Cor. XI. 16. From hence he carries us back to the First Epistle unto the *Corinthians*, *Chap.* XI. 16. which no doubt he would have put before the Second, could he have found the Word *Rule there*; which was all he sought for, not regarding the Sense. But, alas! he could find only the Word *Custome* in that place; which he hoped his foolish Reader would be content to take for the same with *Rule*. And what is this *Rule* (as he will needs have it) of which the Apostle is there speaking? Is it about any matter of Faith? No, only about Womens praying bare-faced, without a covering over them; which the Apostle says was against the *Custom* of the Church. So the same *Menochius*, whom alone I mention of later writers in their Church; because he saith, in his Preface, he hath gathered his Commentaries out of all the best Writers. And what Church doth St. *Paul* here mean? only one Church, or all that he had planted? He himself answers; *We have no such custom, nor other Churches of God neither; therefore you not only cross us, but the whole Church*, as *Theophylact* expounds the words: And to the same effect *Theodoret*, he shows that these things

things did not *ſeem ſo to him only, but to all the Churches of God.* Let the *Romaniſts* ſhow us any ſuch Authority as this, *of all the Churches*, for any thing wherein we differ, and ſee whether we will be *contentious*: Tho' I muſt tell them, that there are a vaſt many differences between the Decrees of the Paſtors of late times, tho' never ſo many hundreds; and the Authority of thoſe few Paſtors (as this man calls them) which had the preſcription only of twenty or thirty years after Chriſt. For theſe *few Paſtors* were the Apoſtles themſelves, infallible men; and other Apoſtolical perſons, who were guided by their directions.

And now he comes to tell us, by what other Titles this *Rule of Faith* is called in Scripture; inſtead of telling us by what names, the *Infallble Rule for underſtanding Scripture* is called: For the good man, when he had gone thus far, had forgotten what he was about.

The *Form of Doctrine* mentioned *Rom.* VI. 17. will do him no ſervice; For it is, ſaith *Theophylact*, *to live aright, and with an excellent Converſation.* Or that Form of Doctrine, ſaith *Menochius*, which the Apoſtles had impreſſed upon the Romans by their preaching: Unto which, is there Rom. VI. 17.

op-

oppoſed, not *diſunion and diſorder*, &c. (as this Scribler pretends) but *their ſerving ſin.* But he hoped his credulous Readers would never trouble themſelves to look into the places he alledges; elſe he would not have had the impudence (if it were not meer ignorance and Folly that betrayed him into it) to mention the next place of Scripture: 2 Corinth. X. 16. *A thing made ready to hand.*

2 Cor. X. 16. He ſhould have ſaid, *things made ready*, if he would have ſtood to his promiſe, of quoting expreſs words of our Bible. For ſo it is both in our Tranſlation, and in the Original, and even in the *Latin* Tranſlation it ſelf. By which is meant, as the ſame *Menochius* judiciouſly obſerves, *Provinces or Countries already cultivated by the preaching of the Apoſtles, and prepared thereby to bring forth fruit.* And ſo *Theodoret*, he reproves thoſe, ſaith he, who *would not preach the Goſpel among unbelievers*, &c. Let the Reader here again look about, and ſee if he can ſpy a word about *diſunion, diſcord, diſobedience*, &c. in this place; of which, this man ſaith there always is mention in the very Text which he alledges.

1 Tim. VI. 20. In the next indeed there is mention of *vain babling; and oppoſition of Science, falſly ſo called*, 1 Tim. VI. 20. Where he bids *Timo-*

Timothy keep that which is committed unto his truſt, (not the *Churches truſt*, as this man again ſhamefully corrupts both our Tranſlation and the Text.) And what is this *depoſitum* or truſt, but the plain Doctrine of the Goſpel? unto which he oppoſes the new Phraſes, and the new Doctrines, which the School of *Simon Magus* had brought in; as *Menochius* interprets it out of *Theodoret*, whoſe words are theſe; They that had their Original from *Simon*, were called *Gnoſticks*, as much as to ſay, men endued with Knowledge: *For thoſe things in which the Holy Scriptures were ſilent, they ſaid God had revealed to them.* This the Apoſtle calls *a falſe Knowledge*; From whence I think it clearly follows, that *Theodoret* thought true Chriſtian Knowledge to be contained only in the Holy Scriptures: Which is the Doctrine he ſaith, (let the Romaniſts mind this) which *all that have the dignity of Prieſthood, ought carefully to keep, and propoſe to themſelves, as a certain Rule, and by this ſquare all that they ſay, all that they do.* In ſhort, *Tertullian* (*de Preſcript.* C. 25.) underſtands by *the thing committed unto him*, that Doctrine which the *Apoſtle* delivered in this Epiſtle. To which *Theodoret* adds, *the grace of the Holy Ghoſt, which he received at his Ordination*:

That is, his Office committed unto him, and all the Gifts of the Spirit bestowed on him, to qualifie him for this Office.

He bids us *see more* in several other places of Scripture, whose words he is not pleased to recite; and therefore I shall pass them by: Because if there had been any thing to be seen in them to his purpose, he would have set them forth at large.

And there is as little to be seen in the *Fathers* whom he mentions, to confirm his pretended Catholick Doctrine. And therefore he doth no more than name *Irenæus*, and *Tertullian*, without alledging their words. But he adventures to set down some words out of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, tho he doth not tell us where to find them. We need not go far indeed to seek for them, they being in the beginning of his Book: where, he that is able to read it, may find a full confutation of the Romish Pretences. For having said, that the way to preserve our Faith sound, is *first* by the Authority of the *Divine Law*; *Secondly*, by the *Tradition* of the *Catholick Church*: He raises this Objection (which shows how much the first of these is above the other) *Since the Rule of the Scripture is perfect, and abundantly sufficient unto it self, for all purposes*, (mark this, which cuts the Throat of the

Roman

Roman Cauſe) *what need is there to joyn unto this, the Authority of the Catholick Senſe?* To which he anſwers, that the Scriptures being a great depth, are not underſtood by all in the ſame Senſe: But *Novatian* underſtands them one way, *Photinus* another; *Sabellius*, *Donatus*, *Arrius*, &c. another. And therefore becauſe of the windings and turnings of Error, the Line of Prophetical and Apoſtolical Interpretation, ſhould be directed according to the Rule of Eccleſiaſtical and Catholick Senſe. Thus he ends his Book, as he begins it. *We have not recourſe to Eccleſiaſtical Tradition, becauſe the Scripture is not ſufficient to it ſelf for all things; but becauſe of various Interpretations.* But then he immediately ſubjoins, in the entrance of his Book, what that Catholick Senſe is (*Chap.* III. viz. *That which is believed every where, and always, and by all.* Which is a Rule by which we in this Church guide our ſelves, and from which the *Church of Rome* hath departed. For which I refer the Reader to King *James* I. his Admonition, *pag.* 331. and the Letter written in his Name to Cardinal *Peron*, where he expreſly owns this Rule, *p.* 22. *Edit. Lond.* 1612.

And yet even this Rule hath its limitations given it by *Vincentius* himſelf; which

this Writer should have been so honest as to have confessed. For in conclusion (Cap. XXXIX.) he saith, that the ancient Consent of Fathers is to be studiously sought and followed, *not in all the little Questions of the Divine Law*, or Scripture, (for alas! there is no Consent) *but only or chiefly in the Rule of Faith.* That is, in those Questions (as he explains it (Cap. XLI) on which the Foundations of the *whole Catholick Faith rely.* And further he observes, That all Heresies cannot always be confuted this way, but only those which are newly invented, as soon as they arise, before they have falsified the Rules of the Ancient Faith, and before they have endeavoured to corrupt the Books of the Ancients, by the spreading of their poison. For inveterate Heresies, and such as have spread themselves, must not be impugned this way, but *only by the Authority of Holy Scripture*; or at least-wise, by the Universal Councils of Catholick Priests, wherein they have been convinced and condemned.

I have been the longer in this, because he is a *most worthy Witness*, as this man calls him; by whom we are willing to be tried. And so we are by *Tertullian*, some of whose words he also at last adventures

to

to alledge, out of two Chapters of his Book of *Prescriptions against Hereticks*. But as he jumbles together words far distant one from another; so he durst not take notice of a Chapter between the XV. and the XIX. which would have explained the reason why sometimes they disputed not with *Hereticks* out of the Scripture; because that Heresy of which he there treats, did not receive some Scripture; and if it did receive some, *it did not receive them intire, but perverted them by additions and detractions, as served its purpose*, &c. In short, *they would not acknowledg these things*, that is, the Scriptures, *by which they should have been convinced.* To what purpose then had it been to talk to them of the Scriptures? No, *let them believe* (saith he Cap. XXIII.) *without the Scripture, that they may believe against the Scripture*; just as the present *Romanists* now do. From whence it is, that he calls Hereticks *Lucifugæ Scripturarum*, men that fly from the light of the Scriptures. Insomuch that he lays down this for a Rule in the same Book, (Cap. III.) *Take from* Hereticks *those things which they have learnt from the Heathen, that they may state their questions out of the Scripture alone; and they cannot stand.* Unto which Rule, if the *Papists* will yield, Cap. XVII. *L. d. Resur. Carn.* C. XLVII.

their Cause is gone. Let all Doctrines be examined by the Scripture, and we desire no more: Unto which it is manifest *Tertullian* appeals in other places so plainly, that there is no way to evade it; particularly in his Book of *the Flesh of Christ*, Cap. VI. Let them prove the Angels took Flesh from the Stars; *if they cannot prove it, because it is not written*, then Christ's Flesh was not from thence, *&c.* And again in the same Chapter, *there is no evidence of this, because the Scripture doth not say it.* And plainest of all in the next Chapter, *I do not receive what thou inferrest of thy own, without Scripture.*

Let these men blush, if they can, who thus shamelessly pervert all things to a wrong sense; as they do these two words, *Rule*, and *Form of Faith*; Which this man hath the Confidence to say, is *the knowledge of Tradition.* But how we should know any Tradition to be true, which is not contained in the Scripture, is the Question; Especially since there have been so many false Traditions, as is confess'd by all sides. Besides, it is so far from being true, that the Two forenamed Fathers lay down Tradition for the Rule of Faith, or put it before the Scripture, that *Vincentius* expressly puts the Divine Scripture

Scripture in the first place as our Guide; and then the Ecclesiastical sense, as a means, in some cases, to find the sense of Scriptures. And *Tertullian* as expressly in that very Book which he quotes, and in the Chapter preceding, makes the *Apostles Creed*, *the Rule of Faith:* Which is all contained in the Scripture, and needs the help of no Tradition but that, to prove it. Cap. XIII.

But after all, I must ask, what's all this which he babbles in the conclusion of this Chapter, to that which he pretends to prove in the beginning? That *there is one Infallible Rule for understanding the Holy Scripture?* Which, if he would have spoken sense, he should have shown is *Tradition*: But not a syllable of this: He only endeavours to lose his Reader in a mist of Words. He knew, if he understood any thing, there is no *Traditive Interpretation* of Scripture: For if there be, Why is there such difference among their own Interpreters in the Expolition of it? Nay, Why do they reject Ancient Interpretations of Scripture, for which there is some Tradition? As *Maldonate*, a famous Jesuite doth upon XIX. *Matt.* 11. Where he confesses, that *almost all expound those words*, as if the sense of them was, XIX. Mat. 11.

that *all men cannot live ſingle*; becauſe all have not the gift of continency: (And among theſe *almoſt all*, he himſelf mentions, *Origen*, *Greg. Nazianzene*, *St. Ambroſe*) *But I cannot perſuade my ſelf*, ſaith he, *to follow this Interpretation.* A moſt remarkable inſtance of the partiality of theſe men, who would tie us to receive the ſenſe of *One* or *Two*, and miſcall us if we will not be bound up by them; but take the Liberty to themſelves, of rejecting *almoſt all*, when it ſerves their Intereſt.

II.

The Proteſtants, he ſaith, affirm.

That in matters of Faith, *we muſt not rely upon the Judgment of the Church and Her Paſtors, but only upon the* Written Word.

Anſwer.

OUR Doctrine is, That the Written Word is the only Rule of our Faith: And therefore we cannot rely barely upon the Judgment of the Church, and of Her Paſtors (as *Papiſts* do) but muſt have what they

they deliver proved out of the Word of God.

This is not contrary to our Bibles, but conformable to them: For they call us *to the law, and to the teſtimony*, VIII. *Iſa.* 20. And the Apoſtles themſelves, we find, nay, our Bleſſed Lord and Saviour, did not deſire to be believed, unleſs they ſpake according to the Scriptures, unto which they appealed, XXIV. *Luke* 27. 44. 1 *Cor.* XV. 3, 4. Whoſe *expreſs words*, if we contradict, we are void of all ſenſe; but if we do not, it muſt be confeſſed he is void of all ſhame, in charging us with affirming that which is contrary to the expreſs words of our own Bibles; particularly XXIII. *Mat.* 2. *The Scribes and Phariſees ſit in Moſes ſeat.* XXIII. Mat. v. 2, *All therefore whatſoever they bid you obſerve*, 3. *that obſerve and do.*

Let the Reader here ſeriouſly conſider, what a Front this Man hath, who talks of *expreſs words*, when there is not an *expreſs Syllable* in this place, either of *Church*, or of *Paſtors*, or of *their Judgment*, or of *Faith.* O! but he ſpeaks of *Scribes and Phariſees*, which is the ſame. But doth this anſwer his Pretenſions of giving us *expreſs Words*, and not words *Tantamount?* And if *Scribes and Phariſes* be equivalent to *Church and Paſtors*, it muſt be his *own*

Church

Church and Pastors, (for they are not our Paterns) which is not much for their Honour to be the *Successors of the Scribes and Pharisees*. Whose Authority sure, was not such, that our Saviour here required his Disciples to *rely upon it, in matters of Faith*. For if they had, they must have rejected their Lord and Master, and denied him to be the Christ. Into this Ditch those blind Guides at last plunged those who blindly followed them. Therefore all that our Saviour here meant, is, (as wiser Men than this, and Jesuits too, acknowledg) that they should obey them, being Teachers, *in all things not repugnant to the Law, and the Divine Commandments*. So the before-named *Menochius* upon the place, to say nothing of the Ancients, who would have thrust out of the Church such a Man as this, who maintains that Christ taught his Disciples, *to obey those Pastors, not only in some principal Matters, but in all whatsoever, without Distinction or Limitation*. Which I may truly say, is a Doctrine of the Devil.

Nor is there any thing *express* in the next place, and therefore he only makes his Inference from it; which should have been this, if he had known how to discourse; *That the Apostles were the Legats and*

X. Luke 16.

and Interpreters of Christ, as Christ was of God. Therefore he that despised the Apostles, despised Christ; as he that despised Christ, despised God. But, what then? Truly nothing to this Man's purpose. For the Church and the Pastors now, have not the Authority of Apostles. If they had, they would not desire, no more than the Apostles did, to be believed without proof from the Scriptures.

Upon the next place, XVI. *Matth.* 19. which is as impertinent, he passes a very wise *Note*; That our Saviour doth not say, *whosoever*, but *whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth*, &c. Whereby he shuts out St. *Peter*, and his Successors (to whom they commonly apply this Text) from all Jurisdiction over *Persons*, and confine it unto *things* only. Let his Church reward him for this Service; for we are not at all concerned in his *Note*; but rather note how far he is still from bringing *express* Texts to his purpose; here being as little express mention of *Faith*, and of *Pastors*, and of the *Church*, and their *Judgment*, as in the former places. And if you will believe *Menochius* (a better Interpreter than this) our Saviour speaks *of the Supreme Power of remitting or retaining Sins, of excommu-* XVI. Mat. 19.

excommunicating and absolving; not a word that he could see, *of untying Knots and Difficulties in Matters of Faith.*

He bids us see more places in XVII. *Deut.* 8. *&c.* But I would advise the Reader not to trouble himself to turn to them. For the *first*, and *two last*, are nothing to his purpose; and the *second* is directly against him. For the Prophet doth not bid them go and ask the Priests *their Opinion*, but ask them what the *Law of God* was, in the case propounded.

And there is as little to be found in the *Fathers*, the last of which is *no Father*. For he lived in the time of our King *Henry* I. and was a stickler for his Master, Pope *Urban*; who in this Man's Logick, is become the *Church* and her *Pastors*, upon whose Judgment we must rely. In good time: they will be Judges in their own Cause, and then the business is done.

III.

His next Charge is, that we affirm,

The Scriptures are eaſy to be underſtood, *and that therefore none ought to be reſtrained from reading of them.*

Anſwer.

THIS is neither *our* Poſition, nor is the contrary *theirs*. For no Proteſtant will ſay, That *all* Scriptures are *eaſy* to be underſtood. Nor will any Papiſt ſay, They are *all hard* to be underſtood. Some are eaſy; as much, that is, as is neceſſary to our Salvation. Which is the expreſs affirmation of St. *Chryſoſtome* in many places, Πάντα ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα. *All things neceſſary are manifeſt*, Hom. 3. in 2 Theſſ.

Now let us ſee what there is expreſly contrary to this in our Bible. *Firſt*, St. *Peter* doth not ſay, That the *Scriptures* are hard to be underſtood; but that there are *ſome things* therein hard to be underſtood; and thoſe things in St. *Paul*'s Epiſtles. The reſt of the Scripture, notwithſtanding this, may be eaſy; and the hard places, he doth not ſay are wreſted by every body, 2 Pet. III. 16.

dy, but only by such as are *unlearned and unstable*. Let us but learn, and be stedfastly fixed in the Principles of Religion, and practice accordingly; then we shall not be in that danger, but may read the *Revelation* it self without hazarding our Salvation. Nothing will be in danger of Destruction by reading the Scriptures humbly and piously (as they themselves teach us to do) but only Men's Vices, and the *Roman Church*; which it is easy to see, in that hard Book The *Revelation*, is doomed in due time unto Destruction. For without understanding every particular Passage, one may easily see in general, with a little help, that *Rome* is there intended; and not *Pagan Rome*, but *Christian*; which is degenerated into an Idolatrous and Tyrannical State.

The following Text is like to this, which doth not say, That the *Eunuch* could understand nothing in the Scriptures (for then he would not have troubled himself to read them) but that he could not understand that place of the Prophet, which he was reading when *Philip* met with him. Which was obscure to him only in part, not in the whole, before he was converted to Christianity; but is not so to us, who enjoy the glorious Light

VIII. Acts 30.

of

of the Goſpel. In which there are ſome things we cannot underſtand; neither with a Guide, nor without: But other things, as I ſaid, are ſo plain, that we cannot miſtake them, unleſs we do it wilfully. Againſt which there in no help, tho we had the *moſt Infallible Guide* that ever was.

The next place ſpeaks not one word of the difficulty of the Scriptures, but rather ſuppoſes them to be eaſy enough, even in thoſe matters of which Chriſt was ſpeaking, (XXIV. *Luke* 25.) if the Apoſtles had not been then *fools*, *and ſlow of heart.* Which Names they had not deſerved, if the Scriptures had been ſo hard, that it was not their fault they could not underſtand them before he expounded them. The things they read there, were not in themſelves difficult, but the Diſciples did not at that time ſufficiently attend to what was written. For if they *could not* (as this Man affirms) have underſtood them, I do not ſee how they could be juſtly blamed by our Saviour; much leſs ſo ſeverely reprehended. Beſides, it is to be obſerved, both of this place and the former, that they ſpeak of the *Prophetical Writings*, in which there are greater Obſcurities than in other Parts of Scriptures; XXIV. Luke 25.

and

and yet even these, if they had not been *Fools*, might have been understood without putting our Saviour to the pains of expounding them.

One would be tempted to think the Man distracted, when he set down the next place, V. *Revel.* 1. to prove his Position. For *the sealed Book*, which the Angel said *no man could read*, was not the Bible, but the ensuing Prophecy; which our Saviour presently after opened, and hath in some measure let us into its meaning. I beseech the Reader to mark what a dolt this Man is, who makes the Book of Scripture *to be shut with so many Seals, that even in St.* John's, *and the Apostles times, none could be found either in Heaven or Earth, able to open the same, or look therein.* For what is the consequence of this, if it be true, but that the Bible must be quite thrown away, and neither *Priest*, nor *Bishop*, nor *Pope*, nor *Council* look therein? For they cannot be more able than St. *John*, and the rest of the Apostles. O that all People would see by what sottish Guides they are led on in darkness!

V. Rev. 1.

If he had thought that heap of Texts which follow, would have done him any Service, we should have had their words no doubt, and not merely the Chapter and

and Verſe; but they are ſet down only for ſhow, and the V. *Revelat.* is reckoned again, to make up the Tale. The *Holy Fathers* are mentioned for no other end, their words being ſo full and ſo numerous on our ſide, that it would fill a bigger Book than this, if I ſhould muſter them up. Particularly, thoſe very Fathers whom he quotes, and in the very Books he mentions, are of our minds. But it is ſufficient for the ordinary Reader to obſerve, that at this Man's rate of proving, no Body muſt read the Scriptures, no, not ſuch as St. *Ambroſe*, if the Scriptures be ſuch a Sea as he ſpeaks of, a depth of Prophetical Riddles. But the truth is, St. *Ambroſe* doth not ſay what this Man makes him ſpeak; Not *that it is a depth*, &c. but that *it hath in it profound Senſes, and a depth of Prophetical Riddles.* It hath ſo, and it hath alſo plain places in it, which are not ſo deep, but they may be fathomed by ordinary, even by ſhallow Capacities. St. *Auſtin* ſaith nothing contrary to this; but muſt be ſuppoſed to know enough, tho much leſs than what he did not know. And ſo muſt the reſt of the Fathers be underſtood, or elſe the Scripture is good for nothing, if even ſuch Men as *Dionyſius*, *Gregory* the Great, *&c.* could underſtand

little or nothing of it. If what they say be to his purpose, it is concerning themselves, and not others; and therefore they ought to have refrained from reading the Scripture, as well as the Vulgar. What then will become of the Common People, if their greatest Guides could know so little of the Mind of God?

His last Author he took upon trust, or else is an egregious Falsifier. For there is nothing to that purpose in the Chapter he quotes, *L.* VII. *cap.* 20. There are words to that effect in the 25th Chapter, where *Irenæus* writing against those who denied the *Revelation of St.* John to be a Divine Book, saith, 'Tho I do not understand it, yet I suppose there is a deeper 'sense in the Words; and not measuring 'those things, nor judging of them by my 'reasonings, but giving more to Faith, '*I esteem them to be higher than to be compre-*'*hended by me*; but I do not reject that 'which I cannot understand, but admire 'it the more, because I am not able to 'understand it. Now, with what face could this Man apply that to the whole Scripture, which is spoken only of the Book of the *Revelation?* Let the Reader judg by this, what honesty he is to expect in other Quotations.

IV. He

IV.

He makes us ſay next,

That Apoſtolical Traditions, *and Ancient Cuſtoms of the Church (not found in the* Written Word*) are not to be received, nor do oblige us.*

Anſwer.

THIS is a downright Calumny; for we have ever owned, that *Apoſtolical Traditions*, if we knew where to find them in any place but the Bible, are to be received and followed, if delivered by them as of neceſſary Obligation. But we do likewiſe ſay, That we know no ſuch Traditions; for thoſe which have been called ſo, have been rejected even by the *Roman* Church it ſelf; or having received them, they have laid them aſide again. In ſhort, they ſometimes pretend to *Traditions*, where there are none; and where there are, they have forſaken them; and in ſeveral Caſes they pervert them, and turn them into another thing. As they have done, for inſtance, with *Purgatory-fire*; which the Ancients thought would be at the Day of Judgment, and not till then;

but they have kindled already, and would have us believe Souls are now frying therein.

As for ancient *Customs*, sometimes called also *Traditions*, they have not been always alike, nor in all places one and the same. But the *Church of* England declares, That *whosoever through his private judgment willingly and purposely doth openly break the Traditions* (i. e Customs) *and Ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common Authority, ought to be rebuked openly*, &c. They are the very words of our XXXIV*th*. Article of Religion. Which teaches withal, That every particular or National Church, hath Authority to change and abolish such Ceremonies or Rites as were ordained by man's Authority, *&c.*

And now what hath this Babbler to alledge out of our Bible against this? Truly, Nothing at all, but only the word *Tradition*, which he is very ignorant, if he do not know that we own. For we affirm, That the Doctrines of the Holy Scripture are Traditions: And of such, the Apostle speaks in 2 *Thess.* II. 15. which is thus expounded by *Theodoret*, *Keep the Rule of Doctrine, the words delivered to you by*

2 Thess II. 15.

by us; which we both Preached when we were present with you, and wrote when we were absent. So that the things which were spoken, were not different from those which were written, but the very same. He spoke when he was with them, what he wrote when he was gone from them. Whence it is clear indeed, That the *Traditions* delivered by word of mouth, were of equal Authority with what was written, (as this man gravely saith), for they were the same. And it is also certain, as he adds, That before the New Testament was written, all was delivered by word of mouth. But what then? Therefore Apostolical Traditions are to be received. Yes; because what was delivered by word of mouth, was the very same which afterwards was written. But here is no shadow of proof, that we are bound to receive Traditions which were never written.

Nor is there more in the next place, 2 *Thess.* III. 6. but much less; for there is not a syllable of word of mouth; and *Theodoret* expressly says, That by *Tradition* here the Apostle means not that διὰ λόγων by *Words*, but that διὰ τῶν ἔργων, by *Works*; that is, he bids them follow his Example, (as St. *Chrysostom* also understands it) 2 Thess. III. 6.

which he proves to be the meaning by what follows; where he saith the Apostle teaches what he had delivered by his Example; *For your selves know how ye ought to follow us; for we behaved not our selves disorderly among you*, &c. v. 7, 8. *Wherefore* (as I may better say than this man doth) *in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, let all good men withdraw from them*, who thus falsly pretend to *Tradition*; when they dare not stand to the Interpretations of the best of the Ancient Fathers; and *walk disorderly*, by breaking their own Rule, which requires them to interpret the Scriptures according to their unanimous consent. *Counc. of* Trent, *Sess.* IV.

From hence he runs back (like a distracted man who catches at any thing at random) to the *First* Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which one would have expected in the Front. But perhaps he was sensible it had nothing in it, but the bare word *Tradition*, to his purpose; and therefore brought it in after he hoped the Reader's mind would be possessed with a false Notion; which would make any thing go down with him. And the truth is, there is nothing here for his turn. For if the *Traditions* mentioned by the Apo-

1 Cor. XI. 2.

stle,

ſtle, be about matters of Order and Decency, (as one would think by what follows, concerning Praying with the head covered or uncovered) they themſelves acknowledge ſuch Traditions do not oblige in all places and times. If the Apoſtle means other Traditions about matters of Doctrine, how doth it appear that now they are not written? As that about the Holy Communion is, which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of in the latter part of that Chapter, *v.* 23, *&c.* In which the Church of *Rome* hath very fairly followed Tradition (I mean ſhamefully forſaken it), by leaving off the miniſtration of the Cup to the people, which according to what the Apoſtle ſaith, *he received from the Lord, and delivered unto them*, ought to be given as much as the Bread.

Conſider then, I beſeech you, with what Conſcience or Senſe this man could ſay, That *we reject all Traditions*, when we receive this, for inſtance, more fully than themſelves. And how he abuſes St. *Paul*, in making him as ſchiſmatically uncharitable as himſelf, by repreſenting him as diſowning us for his Brethren (which St. *Auſtin* durſt not do by the *Donatiſts*) who are ſo far from *forgetting him in all things*, that we remember him and his

words better than they do; and keep to his Traditions (as I said) just *as he hath delivered them unto us.* Poor man! he thinks he hath made a fine speech for St. *Paul*, and made him say to us, quite contrary to that he says to the *Corinthians.* Whereas, (according to *Theodoret*, another kind of Interpreter than he) the Apostle dispraises the *Corinthians*, as much as he makes him dispraise us: For these words, saith he, do not contain *true Praise*; but he speaks *ironically*, and in truth reprehends them, *as not having kept the Orders which he had set them.* As if he had said, *You have full well observed the Traditions which I left with you; when there is such unbecoming behaviour among you, in the time of Divine Service.* Which no body need be told, unless he be such an Ideot as this, is not a form of Commendation, but of Reproof.

Lastly, He comes from *express Scripture*, to none at all; for he betakes himself to Reasoning, and asks a very doughty question; *If nothing be to be believed, but only what is left us written, wherein should the Church have exercised her self from* Adam *to* Moses, *the space of Two thousand six hundred years?*

Let

Let me ask him another, How doth he prove nothing was written all this time? Whence had *Moſes* all that he writes of the Times before him, if not out of Ancient Records? It is more likely there were Writings before his, than that there were not. However, our ſaying, There were, can no more be confuted, than his ſaying, There were not, can be proved.

If the Reader be not ſatisfied with this, he bids him ſee more Scriptures, and names near a dozen places; in never a one of which there is *any* mention, much leſs *expreſs* mention of Tradition: And in the laſt, the *Decrees* which the Apoſtles are ſaid to deliver, are *expreſly* written alſo in that very Chapter and place which he quotes, XV. *Actis* 28. For it is ſaid, v. 23. *They wrote letters after this manner*, &c. and *v.* 30. *They gathered the multitude, and delivered the* EPISTLE. What an unlucky man is this, to confute himſelf after this faſhion?

As for his *Fathers*, he durſt not quote the words of any, but *two* only; St. *Baſil* and St. *Chryſoſtome*. The *firſt* of which are out of a counterfeit part of a book of St. *Baſil* *; into which ſomebody hath foiſted a diſcourſe about *Tradition*, which as it belongs not at all to his ſubject, ſo it

* De Spiritu Sancto, c. 27.

contra-

contradicts his sense in another place: Particularly in his book of *Confession of Faith*; where he saith, *It is a manifest infidelity and arrogance, either to reject what is written, or to add any thing that is not written.* But admit those words which this man quotes, to be St. *Basil*'s, they are manifestly false, by the confession of the *Roman* Church, in that sense wherein he takes them: For if those things which he reckons up as *Apostolical Traditions*, have equal force with those things which are written in the Scripture, how comes the Church of *Rome* to lay aside several of them? For instance; the *words of Invocation at the ostension of the Bread of the Eucharist, and the Cup of Blessing*; *the Consecration of him that is baptized*; *standing in Prayer on the first day of the week, and all the time between* Easter *and* Whitsontide? And how comes it about that others of them are left at liberty, such as *Praying towards the* East, and the *Threefold Immersion in Baptism*? Both which they themselves acknowledge to be indifferent; and yet are mentioned by this false St. *Basil* (so I cannot but esteem him that wrote this) among the things which are of *equal force unto Godliness with those delivered in Scripture.* Nay, he proceeds so far as to say in the words follow-

following, that if we ſhould reject ſuch unwritten Traditions, we ſhould give a deadly wound to the Goſpel; or rather contract it into a bare Name. A ſaying ſo ſenſeleſs, or rather impious, that if theſe men had but a grain of common honeſty, they could not thus endeavour to impoſe upon the world, by ſuch ſpurious ſtuff, as I would willingly think they have wit enough to ſee this is.

As for St. *Chryſoſtome*, it is manifeſt he ſpeaks of the *Traditions of the whole Church*. And unleſs they be confirmed by Scripture, he contradicts himſelf in ſaying, *Traditions not written are worthy of belief*. For upon *Pſal.* 95. he ſaith expreſly, *If any thing unwritten be ſpoken, the* * *underſtanding of the auditors halts and wavers, ſometimes inclining, ſometimes hæſitating*; ſometimes turning away from it as a frivolous ſaying, and again receiving it as probable; *but when the* * *written Teſtimony of the Divine voice comes forth, it confirms and eſtabliſhes, both the words of the ſpeaker, and the minds of the hearers.*

* Αὐτὴ γὰρ ἄγραφον, &c.

* Ὅταν δὲ ἔγγραφος ἡ μαρτυρία, &c. Pag. 924. 30. Edit. Sav.

Next

V.

Next he makes us affirm:

That a man by his own understanding, or private spirit, may rightly judge and interpret Scripture.

Answer.

THere is no such crude saying as this among us: But that which we affirm is, That *a man may, in the faithful use of such means as God hath appointed, rightly understand the Holy Scripture, so far as is necessary for his Salvation.* Who should understand or judge for him, but his own understanding, we can no more understand, than who should see for him but his own eyes, if he have any, and be not blind.

And what is there to be found in our Bibles *expressly* against this? The *first* place is far from *express*; for the gift of *Prophecying* doth not to every one *expressly* signifie the *interpreting* of Scripture; it having manifestly another signification in some places, *viz. Inditing Hymns.* Besides, if this place were pertinent, forbidding all to interpret Scripture, but only such

1 Cor. XII. 8.

as

as have the Gift of Prophecy; their Church must not meddle with that work, for they have not that Gift, no more than those that follow, *discerning of Spirits, divers kinds of Tongues*, &c.

His second place is as impertinent, for it doth not speak at all of *interpreting* the Scripture, but of the Prophetical Scripture it self. Which was *not of private interpretation*; that is, *the proper invention of them that Prophecied; for the Prophetical Oracles were given forth, not at the will and pleasure of man, but the Holy Prophets when they laid open secret things, or foretold future, were acted by the Spirit of God, and spake those things which were suggested by Him.* These are the words of *Menochius*; which are sufficient to show the gross stupidity of this mans Glosses; who babbles here about a *company* of men, and those very *holy*, who are to do he knows not what; which private and prophane men cannot do. As if all *private men* were *prophane*, and all *companies* of men were *holy*. The Lord help them, who follow such Guides as these. 2 Pet. I. 20, 21.

The *third* place, if it say any thing to this purpose, is expresly against him. For it is a direction to every Christian, not to be of too hasty belief. But *to try the Spirits*, that 1 Joh. IV. 1.

that is, *Doctrines* which pretended to be from the Spirit of God. Now how should Christians *try* or *examine* them, but by using their own understandings, to discern between pretended inspirations and true. If they must let others judge for them, they cross the Apostle's Doctrine; for they do not *try*, but *trust*. To tell us, that their Church is infallible, and therefore ought to judg for us; is a pretence that must also be tried, above all things else; and in which every man's particular judgment must be satisfied, or else he cannot with reason believe it. And to believe it without reason, is to be a fool: Nor doth the Apostle leave those to whom he writes, without a plain rule whereby to judge of Spirits; but lays down these two in the following words: 1. If any man *denied Jesus Christ to come in the flesh*, he was a deceiver, *v.* 2. And, 2*ly*, if any man rejected the Apostles, and would not hear them, he was not to be received himself, *v.* 6. *Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.* This makes it plain, the Apostle did not leave them *then*, without means of judging aright, as he hath not left us *now*, who are to try all things by the *Doctrine of Christ and of his Apostles.*

What

What this man means by *the ſpirit of the whole Church*, which cannot be tried by particular men, is paſt my underſtanding; and I believe he did not underſtand it himſelf, but uſed it as a big phraſe, to amuſe poor people withal. Who may eaſily underſtand that St. *John* ſpeaks of *particular perſons*, or of the *Doctrines* vented by certain perſons, who pretended to be inſpired; whom every particular Chriſtian was bound to examine and try by this mark, whether they contradicted what the Apoſtles taught; which was ſufficient, if they did, to diſcover them to be Impoſtors.

His *Fathers* he only names, and therefor they ſignifie nothing to common Readers; for whoſe ſake I write this confutation of his folly. Which makes him bring in *Luther*, as ſaying the ſame that he doth; that is, giving him the lye; who accuſes Proteſtants of affirming that, which the very chief of them (according to him) denies. But whether *Luther* ſay as he makes him, or in what ſenſe, I am not able to affirm, for I cannot find the words.

They

VI.

They affirm,

That St. Peter's *Faith hath failed.*

Anſwer.

THere needs no more to make him confeſs the truth of this, than only to ask him, whether St. *Peter* did not deny his Maſter; which our Saviour ſuppoſes in the words immediately following thoſe he quotes, *Luk.* 22. 32. *When thou art converted, ſtrengthen thy Brethren.* He was therefore out of the way for a time; which is all we mean when any of us ſay, *Peter's Faith hath failed.* Not *finally*, but for that *preſent*. He fell, though he recovered himſelf. So that this is an Equivocal Propoſition, *Peter's Faith hath failed*, which is true; and ſo is the contrary, *his faith hath not failed.* Both are true in different reſpects: It did fail, and that notoriouſly, when he denied his Maſter over and over: But it was more ſtedfaſt afterward, even by his fall; which our Saviour foreſeeing, prayed particularly for him, that he might not utterly miſcarry. Which is no Prerogative, as this man fancies it, that Chriſt

Luk. XXII. 32.

prayed

prayed principally for him, but rather tended to his diſparagement, as denoting him to be weaker than the reſt; and indeed ſo much the weaker, becauſe in his own opinion he was the ſtrongeſt.

The *ſecond* Text *Mat.* 16. 18. as he manages it, is expreſly to another purpoſe. XVI. Mat. 18. For he lays the weight of his Diſcourſe (it appears by the conſequence he draws) upon thoſe words, *the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt*: What? the Text ſaith expreſly againſt *it*, that is the *Church*, not againſt *thee*, that is, *Peter*. They that are wiſer, argue from the foregoing words, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock, &c.* If this be to his purpoſe, the *faith* of St. *Peter* muſt be the Rock upon which the Church is built (which they do not love to hear of) and if it be the Rock, was thrown down, and the *gates of hell* prevailed againſt it, at the time before mention'd, when he denied his Maſter. Which made a great man * ſay, *Doubtleſs that Religion which hath no better ground of Infallibility than* Peter's *faith, which was not ſecured from a threefold denial of Chriſt, was firſt planted by the ſpirit of error and Antichriſt.* Dr. *Jackſ.* L. 3. c. 7.

The *third* Text we had before in the ſecond Chapter, where I have anſwered

XXIII. Matth. 2,3 his question, how Christ might command the people and his Disciples also, to do whatsoever they that *sat in* Moses *his chair had them*, and yet those Doctors might err. But to prove that *Peter's faith could not fail*, he asserts *the Scribes and Pharisees*, when they sat in *Moses* his Chair, *could not err*; which is to justifie their putting our Lord Christ to death. Whither will not the folly of such men as this, carry them? who mind not when they overthrow the Christian Religion, to establish their own conceits. Nay, this man doth not mind, when he ruins even his own conceits. For if the truth of Christian Religion hath been no better preserved by the *Romanists* in the Chair of St. *Peter*, than the truth of the *Jewish* Religion was preserved by the Scribes and Pharisees in the Chair of *Moses*, the *Roman* Church is certainly become Antichristian.

XI. Joh. 49, 51. He hath pickt up a fourth Text, which hath nothing in it of *Peter*, no more than the former, but only tells us, that the *Jewish* High Priest Prophecied, XI. *Joh.* 49, 51. Yet this is an express Text, forsooth, to prove that *Peter's faith could not fail.* It is not easie to have patience enough, so much as to

to read ſuch wretched, nay wicked ſtuff, as this. Which ſtill proves, if it be to the purpoſe, that the High Prieſt ſpeaking forth of his Chair, could not but determine truly; and, conſequently, gave a right judgment when he condemned Chriſt to be put to death. For he ſat in the ſame Chair, when he paſſed ſentence on Chriſt, and when he thus Prophecied; both were in a Council, which was aſſembled on purpoſe to reſolve what to do with him, XI. *Joh.* 47. XXVI. *Mat.* 57.

Here the good man is in great want of *Fathers*, and contents himſelf, becauſe he cannot help it, with *Leo*; whoſe words he doth not rightly tranſlate. For *Leo* doth not ſay, *If the Head were invincible*, but *if the Mind of the Chief were not conquered.* Worſted it was for the preſent, though not quite overcome. For he loſt the confeſſion of Faith with his mouth, ſaith *Theophylact*, though he kept the Faith (or the *ſeeds of faith*, as he ſpeaks) in his heart. But unleſs a man do confeſs with his mouth, as well as believe in his heart, he cannot be ſaved. Both are neceſſary, unleſs St. *Paul* croſs St. *Peter*, X. *Rom.* 9, 10.

But what is all this to the purpose? suppose St. *Peter's faith did not fail*, what then? Must we conclude from thence, *the Pope's faith cannot fail?* Stay there. One of his own Communion, a great man * indeed, hath shown, that there being four Interpretations of this place (XXII. *Luk.* 32.) the greatest number of Ecclesiastical Writers (he reckons up XLIV. and among the rest this Pope *Leo*) expound it of the Faith *of Peter alone*, which Christ prayed might not be lost in that time of Temptation which was a coming. But next to this, they are most numerous who think Christ prayed for the *Universal Church*, that it may never fail in the faith. In which number is *Thomas Aquinas*, one of their Saints; who expresly proves from this place, that the Universal Church cannot err, because *he who was always heard by God, said to* Peter, *upon whose confession the Church is founded, I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.* Where it is evident, he did not think our Lord prayed for *Peter* separately from the rest of the Church; but for the whole Church, *whose person* Peter *sustained*, as St. *Austin* is wont to speak: Or, as *Gregory* the Great's words are, *of which Church he was the first Member.*

* *Launoy* Part V. Epist. ad *Jac. Bevil-laq.*

But

But this belongs to the next Head; where he ſaith we affirm,

VII.

That the Church can err, and hath erred.

WHich is true in one ſenſe, though not true in another. For if by *Church* be meant the Univerſal Church; and by *erring* be meant, departing from the Truth in matters of neceſſary belief; then we ſay the Church (though it may miſtake in matters of leſſer moment, yet) cannot thus err, becauſe Chriſt will always have a Church upon Earth; which cannot be, without the belief of all things neceſſary to make it a Church. But if by Church, be meant the *Church of* Rome, or any other *particular Church*, we ſay it may err, even in matters of neceſſary belief (as St. *Paul* plainly ſuppoſes in his caution he gives the *Romans*, XI. Rom. 20, 21.) and thus many Churches have erred, and faln from Chriſtianity.

Now what hath he to ſay out of our Bibles, which is expreſly contrary to this?

First, he alledges a place out of the Prophet *Isaiah*, LIX. Chap. 21. where there is not one expres word either of the *Church*, or of *its not erring*; but only of what God will do for those who *turn from transgression in Jacob*, (as the words before going are) upon whom (we may suppose) he Covenants and engages to bestow *his Spirit*, *&c.* Now before the Church of *Rome* (whom this man here intends) can apply this Text to themselves, they must prove that they are the people *who turn from transgression in Jacob*; which will be a very difficult task. And when that's done, this Text may prove to be a *command* rather than a *promise*, that it is their duty, having *God's Spirit, who by faith and charity is diffused in the whole Church, that is, in the hearts of the faithful* (as *Menochius* here glosses); and *his words*, that is, saith he, *his precepts*, they should keep them faithfully, and not suffer them to depart out of their own mouth, and their own heart (as he goes on) or out of the mouth and heart of their Children. It is a most wretched inference (for after all his brags of *expres* Texts, he is fain to come to that at last) which this man draws from hence, *therefore the Church cannot err.* He might (with respect

LIX. Isa. 21.

reſpect to the ſenſe) have ſaid more colourably, *therefore the Church cannot ſin.* The folly of which every one ſees; men being too negligent on their part, when God hath done his.

The next place is leſs to the purpoſe; for it is a *peculiar promiſe* (as appears by the whole context) unto the Apoſtles of Chriſt. *In whoſe hearts* he promiſes *the Holy Ghoſt ſhall inhabit*, as *Menochius* expounds it, *performing the Office of a Comforter, and of an Inſtructer.* And this *for ever*; not for ſo ſhort a time as Chriſt ſtayed on Earth with them, but *all the days of their life.* But let us extend this promiſe to their Succeſſors, they can never prove the Apoſtles have no Succeſſor, but only at *Rome.* To which this promiſe can by no inferences be confined, but muſt extend to the whole Church of Chriſt, with whom he is ſtill preſent by his Spirit, to preſerve them in the way of truth, if they will be led by it. XIV. Joh. 16.

In the nex place, XVIII. *Mat.* 17. he is at his *C ll ctions* again, inſtead of *expreſs* words; for his Talent is meer bragging, without any performance. But how doth he gather from this Text, that *the Church cannot err?* Why, that he leaves to his Reader, telling him only, *it may be clearly ga-* XVIII. Matth. 17.

thered; but he, for his part did not know how, though *it may be* others do. Let them try, who have a mind. I can find nothing in this place, which concerns *matters of faith*; and he himself seems to be sensible of it, when he saith the Church cannot err *in her Censure*. But what *Church* is this? and what *Censure?* It belongs to every Church to censure him that wrongs his Brother, after he hath been admonished of the injury he hath done, *first* in private, and then before *two* or *three* Witnesses. This being done, where should he be proceeded against, but in the Church where he lives? Unto which if he will not submit, but continue obstinately his injurious actions, he is justly to be lookt upon as no Christian. No man that is unprejudiced, can read this Text, with all its circumstances, and not take this to be the sense of the words. And then, if they prove *the Church cannot err*, we shall have as many *infallible Tribunals*, as there are Churches.

XXXV. If. 8. That which follows, XXXV. *Isa.* 8. speaks of *not erring*, but says nothing of the *Church*; unless he make the Church to *be fools*, who the Prophet saith *shall not err*. How much wiser would this man have been, if he had but consulted some such

ſuch Author as *Menochius*; Who, obſerving that the Prophet ſaith, *v.* 4. *God will come, he will, and ſave you*, i. e. God incarnate, as he expounds it; by *the way* (here mentioned *v.* 8.) underſtands that narrow way which he taught, leading *by holineſs of manners and life to the holy place*, i. e. to Heaven. And upon the laſt words, *fools ſhall not err therein*; gives us this good *Proteſtant* Gloſs; *for even the ſimple and unskilful might eaſily learn thoſe things which are neceſſary to ſalvation.* The way is plain in theſe matters, and none need err about them, unleſs they will. And I wiſh it was not a *wilful error* in this man, to ſay that we affirm, *the whole Church, and all holy men that ever have been therein, for theſe* 1000 *years, have erred.* There cannot be a greater calumny; for we believe the whole Church cannot ſtray from the way that leads to Heaven; though ſome particular Churches may.

There is nothing contrary to this in V. *Epheſ.* 27. Which if it prove any thing of this nature, proves the Church is ſo perfectly pure, that it hath no ſin in it. But I doubt we muſt ſtay for this happineſs, till the other world, when the Church will indeed be made *a Glorious Church.* I have noted, as he deſires, the words, V. Epheſ. 27.

words, *without spot, wrinkle, or any blemish*; and yet I think it possible that some Church or other hath taught *horrible Blasphemies and Abominations*. For St. *John* in the *Revelation* tells us, it is not only possible, but certain, XVII. *Rev.* 3, 4. And there are, we think very evident proofs, that the present *Roman* Church, of which he is so fond (and always hath in his mind, when he speaks of the Church) is described by St. *John* in that place.

We have seen so little in these Texts, that I cannot find in my heart to look into the rest; several of which we have had already, as XXII. *Luk.* 32. XXIII. *Mat.* 3. XVII. *Deut.* 8. XV. *Act.* 28. And he seems to have intended nothing, but meerly to make a show of more strength than he had; which made him thrust in among the rest, V. *Ephes.* 27. which I have just now examined. His *Fathers* also are only Names, without their sense, and so let them pass. Next, he saith, we affirm,

VII.

VII.

That the Church hath been hidden, and inviſible.

HE ſtill goes on, in his ambiguous way of ſtating our Doctrine. There are no *Papiſts* but confeſs that the moſt excellent parts, even of the *viſible Church* in this world, are inviſible or hidden. For none but God, who ſearches the heart, can know certainly, who are truly good men, and not hypocrites. And there are no *Proteſtants* who maintain, that they who profeſs the Chriſtian Religion (who are the *Church*) have ever been hidden and inviſible. But this they ſay, that this Church hath not been always viſible, free from corruption; and that it hath not been at all times alike viſible; but ſometimes more, ſometimes leſs conſpicuous. Now theſe men by the *Viſibility* of the Church, mean ſuch an illuſtrious ſtate, as by its glory, ſplendor and pomp all men may be led to it. This is it, and no more, which *Proteſtants* deny. And Mr. *Chillingworth* hath long ago told them, that the moſt *rigid Proteſtants* do not deny the *Viſi-*

Viſibility of the Church abſolutely, but only *this degree* of it. For the Church hath not always had open viſible Aſſemblies; and ſo might be ſaid to have been hidden and inviſible, when they met under ground and in obſcure places.

There is nothing in the Texts of Scripture which he quotes, contrary to this, much leſs *expreſly* contrary.

V. Mat. 14, 15. The *firſt* of them, V. *Mat.* 14, 15. is manifeſtly a precept to the Apoſtles, ſetting forth the duty incumbent upon them by their Office, that they might gather a Church to Chriſt. So the before-named *Menochius* interprets thoſe words, *Ye are the light of the world*, who ought to illuminate the world by your Doctrine and Example. You ought not to be hid; no more than a City can be, which is ſeated on a hill: *Men do not light a candle (much leſs God) to put it under a Buſhel. Our Saviour*, ſaith he, *exhorts his Diſciples by this ſimilitude, that they ſhould diligently ſhine, both in their words, and in their example; and not be ſparing of their pains, or of themſelves, by withdrawing themſelves from the work, but communicate their light liberally to their neighbours.* But after the world was thus illuminated by their Doctrine (which they could not always neither Preach in publick

publick, but some times only in private houses) Christians were forced to meet together, in some *places* and *times*, very secretly; not being able always to hold such publick visible Assemblies, that all men beheld them, and what they did.

The *second* we had before to prove *the Church cannot err*; and now it is served up again to prove *it was never hid*; and this not expresly, but by a consequence, and that a very sensless one. For whoever said or thought, that *no body* can see a Church, when it is not visible to *every body?* It's members no doubt see it, even when it is invisible to others. Any man may be seen by his Friends, when he lies hid from his Enemies. And a Church is visible in that place where it is planted, and by them that belong to it, though strangers perhaps take no notice of it, especially those that are at a distance from it. XVIII. Matth. 17.

In the *third* place, we have mention of the *Gospel*, but not a word of the *Church*; which he puts in (such is his honesty) contrary to the expres words of ours, and of all Bibles. Nor doth the Apostle deny rhe *Gospel* to be hid, but expresly supposes it (2 *Cor.* IV. 3.) that it is hid from those whose minds are blinded by the 2 Cor. IV. 3, 4.

god

god of this world; who shut their eyes against the clearest light, *even the light of the knowledg of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.* One would think this man besides himself, when he bids us behold the censure of St. *Paul* upon those who affirm the Gospel can be hid; when his words are a plain supposition, that it was hid to some people; Not indeed because they could not (for it was visible enough in it self) but because they would not see it. And I wish there be not too many of this sort in that Church for which this Writer stickles.

The *last* place is an illustrious Prophecy of the setting up the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Which was very visible in its beginning, when the Holy Ghost came down upon the Apostles, and by them *the Law*, that is, the Christian Doctrine, *went out of Sion, and the word of the Lord*, that is the Gospel, *from Jerusalem.* But did not always continue so, when grievous Persecutions arose for the Gospel's sake, and drove the visible Professors of the Religion into obscure places. And I hope he will allow those Scriptures to be as true as these, which say there shall be *an Apostacy from the Faith*, and that the Church shall *fly into the Wilderness*, 2 Thess. II. 3.

II. Isa. 2.

II. 3. XII. *Revel.* 6. which is not conſiſtent with ſuch a viſibility of the Church as this man dreams of.

As for the Prophecies which mention a *Kingdom of Chriſt*, particularly VII. *Dan.* 14. they point at a ſtate of his Church, which is not yet come; and when it doth come, will be with a vengeance to the *Roman Church*. Whoſe preſent ſtate will be utterly overturned, to make way for the ſetting up of Chriſt's Univerſal and Everlaſting Kingdom. Which is to be erected when *the Myſtery of God is finiſhed*, X. Revel. 7. & XI. 15. and that cannot be, till *Babylon*, that is *Rome*, be thrown down, *XVIII. Revel.* 2. & *XIX.* 1, 2, 6. And we are ſo far from thinking this Kingdom will be inviſible, that we believe it will be the moſt illuſtrious appearance that ever was, of Chriſtian Truth, Righteouſneſs, Charity and Peace among men. VII. Dan. 14.

He bids us, as his manner is, *ſee more* in other places. But if they had more in them than theſe, we ſhould have had them at length. And his *Fathers* alſo; ſome light touches of which he gives us, juſt as he found them in a cluſter altogether, word for word, in a Book called, *The Rule of Faith, and the Marks of the Church*; which was anſwered above

LXXX.

LXXX. years ago, by Dr. *J. White*, who obſerves,* that when *Origen* (whom upon other occaſions they call an *Heretick*) ſaith, *The Church is full of VVitneſſes from the Eaſt to the VVeſt*; he ſpeaks not of the outward ſtate or appearance thereof, but of the truth profeſſed therein. Which though clear to the World, when he ſaid ſo; yet doth not prove it ſhall be always ſo; for a Cloud of Apoſtacy might and did afterward obſcure it.

* *Way to the True Church.* Sect. 23.

St. *Chryſoſtome* doth not mean that the Church cannot be at all darkned; but not ſo, as to be extinguiſhed, no more than the Sun can be put out. For he could not be ſo ſenſleſs, as not to know, that it had been for a time eclipſed.

When St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *They are blind, who ſee not ſo great a mountain.* He ſpeaks againſt the *Donatiſts*, who confined the Church to themſelves, as the *Papiſts* now do. And he juſtly calls them blind, who could not ſee the Church all *Africk* over, it being at that time as plain as a *Mountain*, or a *lighted Candle*, as our Church now is at this day. But his words do not imply, that the Church ſhall always be ſo manifeſt, and never hid; Mountains themſelves being ſometimes hidden in a miſt. For he ſaith in other places, *The Church*

Church ſhall ſometimes be obſcured, and the Cloud of Offences may ſhadow it, Epiſt. 48. *It ſhall not appear by reaſon of the unmeaſurable Rage of Ungodly Perſecutors*, Epiſt. 80. *It is like the Moon, and may be hid*, in XIX. Pſalm. *Yea, ſo obſcured, that the Members of it may not know one another*; as he ſpeaks in his *ſixth* Book of Baptiſm, againſt the *Donatiſts*, *C.* 4.

What St. *Cyprian* ſaith, is not contrary to this.

V.

We maintain, he ſaith,

That the Church was not always to remain Catholick, or Univerſal; and that the Church of Rome *is not ſuch a Church.*

Anſwer.

WE maintain the quite contrary to the *firſt Part* of his Propoſition; aſſerting that *the Church is always to remain Catholick, or Univerſal*; not confined to one Country as the *Jewiſh* was, but ſpread all the World over. The *ſecond Part* in-

deed we do maintain, That *the Church of* Rome *is not such a Church*; that is (which is the thing they contend for) is not the Universal Church, but hath its limits, and was anciently bounded within certain *Regions*, beyond which it did not extend.

The *first* Scripture he alledges against us, is a promise to Christ, which we believe hath been fulfilled in part, and will be more and more fulfilled before the end of the World; but hath nothing in it peculiar to the Church of *Rome*; which at the best, is but a piece of his *Inheritance*.

II. Psalm 8.

The *second* speaks expressly, not of the *Universality* of Christ's Kingdom, but of its *Perpetuity*; and is as much verified in other Churches, as in the *Roman*; which is so far from being the only Universal Church, that in this sense, it is not Universal at all.

I. Luke 33.

The *third* is directly against him. For it shows that *the Faith of the Gospel* (unto which he now skips, when he should have said *the Church*, of which he was speaking) was planted at *Colosse*, (which was never under the Jurisdiction of *Rome*) and there fructified and grew, as much as in other places.

I. Colos. 3, &c.

Nor

Nor will the next place help him; where St. *Paul* doth not call the Faith of the whole World, the Faith of the *Romans*, but only faith, *their faith was ſpoken of throughout the whole world*, I. Rom. 8. that is, *the fame of it was ſpread all the world over*; as *Menochius*, one of their own, honeſtly interprets it. For what was done at *Rome*, could not be concealed from the reſt of the World, ſaith *Theodoret*, becauſe the *Roman* Emperors having their Palace there, from whence all ſort of Officers were ſent, and whither all People reſorted who had any boon to beg; by whom it was ſignified every where, *That the City of* Rome *had received the Faith of Chriſt.* Thus he; which ſhows the Goſpel was ſpread in the World, before it came to the City of *Rome*; it not coming from thence, but from *Jeruſalem*; and not coming thither till many other places had received it, who were not beholden to *Rome* for it. With what face then, againſt ſuch a clear ſenſe of the words, could this Man ſay that St. *Paul* in expreſs terms, calls, *The Faith of the whole World*, *the Faith of the* Romans, *or the Church of* Rome? When the words rather import, that he calls the Faith of the *Romans*, the Faith received in the whole World. But I. Rom. 8.

he saith neither the one, nor the other; tho if he had, it would prove nothing, but that there was one and the same Faith then at *Rome*, which was in other places. The truly *Catholick Faith*, from whence *Churches* were named *Catholick*, (not from their extending all the World over, which was impossible) and *Jerusalem*, and other Churches were as much so, as *Rome* it self, and were so before there was a Church at *Rome*. In short, a *Catholick Church* signified no more than an *Orthodox Church*.

It is a matter of serious Lamentation, that men should go about to pervert such plain and easy Truths, as this; and should heap up Scriptures to prove mere *Nonsence*: For all the Scriptures which he bids us further look into, he saith, are not to be understood, *That the whole World should be Catholick at one and the same time*. Let the Reader consider what it is, for the *whole World to be Catholick*, as he hath explained it, but for *the whole World to be the whole World*.

And he will have an hard task, to make Sense of the next words; that the *whole World* being converted unto Christ at sundry times, it shall comprehend *a greater part of the World*, than any Sect of Hereticks

reticks shall ever do. I thought the *whole World* would certainly comprehended the whole World, and not only the *greater part of the World.* It is impossible, by such *Jargon* as this, to understand the true Sense of being *Catholick* or *Universal.* Which the Church is, either with respect *to Faith*; becaufe there is the same Faith in all parts of the true Church; or with respect to *Place*, because no Country is excluded from it, which will receive this Faith; or with respect to *Time*, because it continues throughout all Ages, tho not always in such an extent, as to be actually in all Nations. For those Countries, which were once Parts of the Catholick Church, are not so now: And if those that are now so, should lose the Faith, still the Church might be Catholick, if others embraced it, as *Bellarmine* * himself confesses, *If only one Province should retain the true Faith, the Church might truly and properly be called Catholick; as long as it might be clearly shown, that it was one and the same with that, which had been at sometime, or in divers throughout the World.*

* L. IV. *De Eccles.* c. 7.

According to his former Method, he carries us now to the *Fathers*, and makes them guilty of as much *Nonsense* as him-

self. For he makes St. *Cyprian* confess, that *part is the whole*. But the comfort is, he either did not understand, or else misrepresents St. *Cyprian*, who speaks not there of the *Authority*, but of the *Example* of the *Roman Church*, and especially of *Cornelius* their Bishop; who remaining constant in time of Tryal, made all his Brethren every where rejoyce; particularly *Cyprian* himself, who in that very place stiles *Cornelius* and others, his *Fellow-Priests* or *Bishops*. For what Priest, saith he, can chuse but rejoyce in the praises of his Fellow-Priests, as if they were his own? It is not to be expressed with what Joy and Exultation he heard of his Fortitude, whereby he made himself a Captain and Leader of Confession unto the Brethren, *&c.* And then follows, *While there is among you* (i. e. *Cornelius* and his Brethren) *one Mind, and one Voice, all the* Roman *Church hath confessed*, that is, *their Faith which the Apostle praised, was become famous*, as it follows in the next words; and while they were thus Unanimous, thus Valiant, *they gave great Examples of Unanimity and Fortitude to the rest of their Brethren.* This is the meaning of *Ecclesia omnis Romana confessa est:* They were all stedfast in their Faith; which this poor man construes,

Epist. LX. Edit. Oxon.

ſtrues, as if St. *Cyprian* owned *Rome* for the only *Catholick Church*. By tranſlating thoſe words thus, *The whole Church is confeſſed to be the* Roman *Church*. Which he vehemently denied, ordaining in a Council at *Carthage* according to Ancient Canons, That every mans Cauſe ſhould be heard there where the Crime was committed; and commanded thoſe to return home, who had appealed to *Rome*; which he ſhows was moſt juſt and reaſonable, unleſs the Authority of the Biſhops in *Africk*, ſeem leſs than the Authority of other Biſhops, to a few deſperate and profligate perſons, who had already been judged and condemned by them. This he writes in another Epiſtle to the ſame *Cornelius*; to which I could add a great deal more, if this were not ſufficient to make ſuch Writers as this bluſh, if they have any ſhame left, who make *the whole Church to be the* Roman *Church*. Epiſt. LIX.

St. *Auſtin* (of whom I muſt ſay ſomething, leſt they pretend we cannot anſwer what is allegded out of him) and the whole Church of *Africk*, in a Council of Two hundred Biſhops, made the ſame Oppoſition to the pretended Authority of the *Roman* Church; and therefore could mean no ſuch thing, as this man would

have, in his Book of the *Unity of the Church*. Where he saith, in the 3*d* Chapter, 'That he would not have the Holy 'Church to be shown him out of Humane 'Teachings, but out of the Divine Ora- 'cles; and if the Holy Scriptures have de- 'sign'd it *in* Africa *alone*, &c. whatsoever 'other Writings may say, the *Donatists* he 'acknowledges will carry the Cause, and 'none be the Church but they. But he proceeds to show the Doctrine of the Scriptures is quite otherwise, designing the Church to be spread throughout the World. And then he goes on to say, (*Chap.* 4.) that whosoever they be who believe in Jesus Christ the Head, *but yet do so dissent* (those are his words, which this man recites imperfectly and treacherously) *from his Body, which is the Church, that their Communion is not with the whole Body, wheresoever it is diffused, but is found in some part separated; it is manifest they are not in the Catholick Church.* Now this speaks no more of the *Roman Church*, than of any other part of the *Catholick* Church; and, in truth, makes them like the *Donatists*; since their Communion is not with the whole Body (which they absolutely refuse to admit to their Communion) but *they are found in a part of it seperated by themselves*.

The

The rest which he quotes out of Saint *Austin*, I assure the Reader, is as much besides the matter, and therefore I will not trouble him with it. And I can find no such saying of St. *Hierom*, in his Apology against *Ruffinus*. But this I find (*L.* 3.) *the Roman Faith praised by the voice of the Apostle* (viz. I. *Rom.* 8.) admits not such *deceit and delusion into it*, &c. Where it is to be noted, That the *Roman Faith* commended by the Apostle, is one thing; and the *Roman Church*, another. And *the Faith* which they had in the Apostles time, was certainly *most pure*: but who shall secure us, it is so now? If we had the voice of an Angel from Heaven to tell us so, we should not believe it; because it is not what they then believed, nor what they believed in St. *Hierom*'s time, but much altered in many Points. And suppose St. *Hierom* had told us, *It is all one to say the Roman Faith, and the Catholick Faith*; it must be meant of the *then* Roman Faith: and it is no more than *might* have been said in the praise of any other Church which held the true Faith. No, nor more than *is* said; for thus *Nicephorus*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, writes in an Epistle * to *Leo* Bishop of *Rome*, *We also have obtained the name of New* Rome, and

* *Council of* Ephes. *p.* 107.

and being built upon one and the same foundation of Faith, the Prophets and Apostles, (mark that, he doth not say *on the Roman Church*) where *Christ our Saviour and God is the Corner-stone, are in the matter of faith, nothing behind the elder* Romans. *For in the Church of God, there is none to be reckoned or numbred before the rest* †. *Wherefore let St.* Paul *glory and rejoice in us also,* &c. (*i.e.* if he were alive, *Nicephorus* doubted not Saint *Paul* would have commended the Faith of that City, as he had theirs at Old *Rome*) *for we as well as they, following his Doctrine and Institutions, wherein we are rooted, are confirmed in the Confession of our Faith, wherein we stand and rejoice,* &c.

† Οὐκέτι τὸ πρωταιθμέμφιον.

X.

The Reformers, he saith, hold

That the Church's Unity is not necessary in all points of Faith.

Answer.

THIS Writer hath so accustomed himself to Fraud and Deceit, that we can scarce hope to have any truth from him. For no Reformers hold any thing

thing of this nature, if by *Points of Faith* be meant what the Apoſtle means in the Text he quotes; where he ſaith, *there is* IV. Epheſ. *One Faith.* Which we believe is neceſſary 5. to make *One Church:* every part of which, bleſſed be God, at this very day, is baptized into that one and the ſame Faith (and no other) contained in the common Creed of Chriſtians, called *the Apoſtles Creed.* Therefore ſo far *Church Unity* is ſtill preſerved. But it is not neceſſary there ſhould be unity in all Opinions that are not contrary to this Faith. Nor ſhould the Differences, which may be among Chriſtians, about ſuch matters, break *Unity of Communion.* And if they do, thoſe Churches which are thus broken and divided, by not having *external communion* one with another, may notwithſtanding ſtill remain, both of them, Members of the ſame *one Catholick Church*, becauſe they ſtill retain the ſame *one Catholick Faith.* Thus the *Aſian* and *Roman* Churches in Pope *Victor*'s time, and the *African* and *Roman* in *Stephen*'s time, differed in external Communion, and yet were ſtill parts of one and the ſame Church of Chriſt.

This is more than I need have ſaid in anſwer to him, but I was willing to ſay ſome-

something useful to the Reader; who cannot but see that he produces Texts of Scripture to contradict his own Fancies, not our Opinions. We believe as the Apostle teaches us, IV. *Ephes.* 5. and from thence conclude, That Unity is necessary in all points of Faith, truly so called; that is, all things necessary to be believed. Nor do we differ in any such things; and therefore have the Unity requisite to one Church.

IV. Ephes. 5.

II. *Jam.* 10. The *second* Text II. *Jam.* 10. speaks not a word of Faith; therefore, instead of express words, this man tells us, by a likeness of reason, it is the same in Faith, that it is in Sin: he who denies one Article, denies all. We deny none; but only their New Articles, which are no part of the Ancient *Apostolick Catholick Faith.*

IV. Act. 32. The next, IV. *Acts* 32. speaks of the Brotherly affection and unanimity that was among the First Christians. And that which follows, 1 *Cor.* I. 10. doth not tell us what was, but what ought to be in the Church: For among those *Corinthians* there were very great Divisions, as appears by that very Chapter. Therefore he is still beside the Book; and very childishly objects to us the Sects that are among us, as an Argument we are not the

1 Cor. I. 10.

the true Believers the Apoſtle ſpeaks of: when the *Apoſtolical Churches* were not free from them while the Apoſtles lived: nor is the *Church of* Rome, or any other Church, at ſuch unity, but there are various Sects among them.

He hath little to do, who will trouble himſelf, upon the account of ſuch a Scribler as this, to conſider that heap of Texts which he hath hudled together, without any order, or any regard to his Point he was to prove. What St. *Auſtin* alſo, and the reſt of his *Fathers* ſay about Unity, doth not at all concern us: who preſerve that Unity which they have broken, by preſerving that *One Faith*, from which they of the *Church of* Rome have departed. For it will not ſuffice them to believe as the Apoſtles did; but they have another Faith of their own deviſing. This is that wherein we cannot unite with them. And all the Unity they brag of, is, in truth, no better than that of the *Jews*, *Hereticks* and *Pagans*: who, as St. *Auſtin* * ſpeaks, maintain *an Unity againſt Unity*. In this they combine together to oppoſe that *one Faith* the Apoſtles delivered, as inſufficient to Salvation. Which is a conſpiracy in Error, rather than unity in the Truth.

* *De Verbis Domini Serm.* VI.

XI.

XI.

That St. Peter *was not ordained by Chriſt the firſt Head, or Chief among the Apoſtles; and that among the Twelve, none was greater, or leſſer than other.*

Anſwer.

WE are now come to the great Point, which is the ſupport of the whole *Roman* Cauſe. But he neither knows our Opinion about it, nor their own: or elſe dares not own what it is. We believe *Peter* was the *firſt* Apoſtle, and that he was *a Chief*, though not *the chief* Apoſtle. For there were others who were eminent (that is, *Chiefs*) upon ſome account or other, as well as himſelf, 2 *Cor.* XI. 5. XII 2. But what he means by a *firſt Head* or *Chief*, neither we, nor thoſe of his own Religion know, unleſs there were *ſecondary Heads* and Chiefs among the Apoſtles, one over another. This is ſtrange language, which none underſtands. *Peter* was *firſt* in *Order*, *Place*, *Precedence*, but not in *Power*, *Authority*, and *Juriſdiction*; in theſe, none was greater or

or leſſer than another. Which is not contrary to any Text in the Bible, but moſt agreeable thereunto.

For ſo the Text ſaith, X. *Matth.* 2. and we needed not his Obſervation to inform us, That all the Evangeliſts, when they mention the Apoſtles which Chriſt choſe, put *Peter* firſt: Which doth not ſignifie he was *the worthieſt of them all*; that no way appears; but that he and *Andrew* his Brother were firſt called, we expreſly read, and poſſibly he might be the Elder of the Two. But if it did denote his *Dignity* and *Worthineſs*, it doth not prove his *Authority* over the reſt, (as he is pleaſed to improve this Obſervation, in the Concluſion of his Note upon this place) for tho he had ſome eminent qualities in him which perhaps were not in others, they gave him no Superiority in Power; but in that, every one of them was his equal. What follows upon this Text, is ſo frivolous and childiſh a reaſoning, it ought to be deſpiſed. X. Matth. 2.

Next he betakes himſelf to the *Rock*, mentioned XVI. *Matth.* 18. which they have been told over and over again, (but they harden their hearts againſt it), is not ſpoken of *Peter*, as this man moſt impudently, contrary to his own Bible, makes XVI. Matth. 18.

makes the words sound, but of *the Faith which* Peter *confessed*; as the general current of Ecclesiastical Writers expound it. But if we should by the *Rock* understand *Peter*, it insinuates no *Supremacy*, much less *clearly insinuates* it. For none but such a man as this, to whom *the Bell clinks just as he thinks*, would have thought of that, at the reading of the word *Rock*; but rather of *Firmness*, *Stability*, or *Solidity*; which the Word plainly enough imports, but nothing of *Authority*. Our Blessed Lord himself is not called a *Rock* or *Stone*, with respect to his being the Soveraign and Absolute Pastor of his Church, but because of the firm Foundation he gives to our Hope in God. Next to those who by *Rock* understand, as I said, the *Faith* which *Peter* confessed, the greatest number of Ancient Expositors understand thereby *Christ* himself. Unto whom this man hath the face to say, these words do not agree, because he speaks of the time to come, *I will build*; as if Christ were not always, what he ever was, being *the same to day, yesterday, and for ever*. It is a burning shame, as we speak, that such men as this should take upon them to be instructors, and to write Books, which have nothing in them but trifling observations,

vations, and falſe allegations For after all, ſhould we grant *Peter* to be the *Rock*, it will not exclude the reſt of the Apoſtles from being ſo, as much as he; for the Church was built upon them all, on *the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets*, II. Epheſ. 20. And accordingly St. *John* had repreſented to him, not *One* alone, but *Twelve* Foundations of the Wall of the *New Jeruſalem*, i.e. the Church of Chriſt; which had *in them the names of the twelve Apoſtles of the Lord*, XXI. Rev. 14.

The next place XVIII. *Matth.* 18. is ſo plain a promiſe to all the Apoſtles, that it is impudence to reſtrain it to St. *Peter*, or to conclude from thence any Preroragative to him above the reſt; eſpecially if it be obſerved, that when this Promiſe was fulfilled, they were all equally partakers of it; when our Saviour breathed on them, and ſaid unto them, (mark that, he breathed on *them* all, and ſaid not to *Peter* alone, but *them*, *i. e.* the Apoſtles), *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt; Whoſe ſoever ſins ye retain, they are retained*, &c. XX. John 22, 23. XVIII. Matth. 18. XX. John 22, 23.

Now he falls a Reaſoning again (for, alas *expreſs* Texts fail him) but it amounts to no more than this, That our Saviour did not call him *Simon* in the forementioned

place, but gave him another name. I am ſorry for his ignorance, that he did not know, or for his diſhoneſty, that he would not conſider; this was become his name as much as *Simon*, before this time; for at their firſt meeting, Chriſt gave him this name of *Peter*, I. John 43.

1 Cor. III. 4. 22. From that which follows, 1 *Cor.* III. 4, 22. there is a wonderful fetch. For as before he argues *Peter*'s Supremacy from his being named *firſt*, ſo now he argues it from his being named *laſt*; whereas in his firſt obſervation it was an argument of *Judas* being the unworthieſt, becauſe named laſt. When he thinks again, perhaps he will prove his Supremacy, becauſe in II. *Gal.* 9. he is named neither firſt nor laſt, but in the middle, between *James* and *John*. And according to his wiſe note, That the Apoſtle aſcends from thoſe he would have eſteemed leſſer, to thoſe whom he would have eſteemed greater, we muſt look upon *Apollos* as greater than *Paul*, becauſe he aſcends here from *Paul* to him, and ſo to *Peter*. Whither will not the Folly of theſe men lead them?

XXII. Luke 31, 32. His Reaſoning (for we are not to expect Expreſs Texts, whatſoever he vainly brags) upon the next place, XXII. *Luke* 31, 32.

31, 32. is still more strange. For who ever heard that to *strengthen* or *confirm* his brethren, can be nothing but to *practice and exercise his greatness over them*? This *Greatness* of his runs so in their heads, that they fancy they see it every where, even where there is not a shadow of it: For none before him sure ever thought, that to strengthen others, is an exercise of Greatness, but rather of Goodness: It implies indeed, that he who establishes another, is in that greater than he; but it doth not follow he is so in any thing else; nor doth it imply any thing of Jurisdiction over others: Tho if it did, they are not the Apostles who are here intended to be *strengthned* (for they were as strong as himself) but the Converted *Jews*, who might be in the same danger wherein he had been. And therefore our Lord bids him learn to pity *their* weakness, by the remembrance of *his own*; and to establish them in that Faith which he had denied.

From hence he leads us back to *v.* 26. of the same Chapter; and from the vain ambition which was in the Apostles, who strove *which of them should be accounted the greatest*, (v. 24.) concludes, That really some of them was greater than others, *viz.* XXII. Luke 26.

in Power and Authority over the rest; or else he concludes nothing: But this vanity our Saviour checks; and therefore it is far from truth, that one of them was accounted greater than another, even *by Christ himself.* No such matter; he only shows them, that if in any quality one excelled another, it should make him more humble and subservient to his Brethren, not swell him, and make him perk up above them. And thus *Theophylact* understands it not of any Superiority in Power, but in other things. For the occasion of their contention, Who should be esteemed greatest; he thinks was this; That there being an enquiry among them which of them should be so wicked as to betray their Master, (*v.* 23.) and one perhaps saying, Thou art likely to be the man; and another, No, it will be thy self; They proceed from hence to say, I am better than you, and I am greater; and such like things: Which our Saviour expresses in the following words, *The Kings of the Gentiles exercise Lordship over them*, &c. *but it shall not be so among you*, &c. Which is a pretty plain denial of any Authority they were to have one over another. And indeed, when he comes to speak of *Power* in the following Verses, *v.* 29, 30. he saith indifferently

differently to them all, *I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me*, &c. It was divided among them; and none had an higher *Throne* given him than his fellows.

We are at laſt come to the main prop of this Cauſe, which is as weak as all the reſt, XXI. *John* 15, 16, 17. For who told him that the word uſed the *ſecond* time by our Saviour, which we Tranſlate *Feed* †, muſt interpret the other two, which are uſed at *firſt* and *laſt*? Why may not they, being uſed *twice*, rather interpret that, which is uſed but *once*? And how doth he prove, that it ſignifies to *govern* and *rule*, rather than *feed*? Or if it do ſignifie *Government*, what's this to his governing the Apoſtles, who had as much Power to Feed and Rule both *Lambs* and *Sheep* as himſelf? And thus the Ancients underſtood this to be ſpoken unto all the Apoſtles, as well as unto him; and even his own Companions, who have more Wit, and leſs Impudence, by *Lambs* and *Sheep*, underſtand, not the *Apoſtles*, but *weaker* and *ſtronger* Chriſtians. I will mention only *Menochius*, whoſe words are theſe, in his Notes upon this place; *By Lambs, he ſignifies, as the very name ſhews, thoſe that were newly converted to the Faith, and*

XXI. Joh. 15, 16, 17.

† Πείμαινε.

were weaker in the Faith; whose number was very great, when the Apostles began to preach, and therefore needed greater care; for which cause Christ repeats this twice, FEED MY LAMBS, *and but once,* FEED MY SHEEP, *who are those that are stronger in the Faith,* and therefore needed less pains to preserve them. This is spoken like a man of sound sense: And with the like Judgment and Integrity he interprets the rest directly contrary to the silly Reasonings of this Trifler; who says, *Peter loved Christ more than the rest, and therefore it follows necessarily, he received more Power to feed, than all the rest did.* This is more than *Peter* himself durst say, That he loved Christ more than the rest. No, says *Menochius*, *He dares not answer, that he loved more than others, but only that he loved; for his fall had made him more modest. He had preferred himself to others, when he said* XXVI. Matth. 33. *Though all be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended; and after this he fell more foully than others; therefore now he speaks of himself what he thinks to be true, but he doth not prefer himself before others, whose hearts he did not see.*

Now I thought we had done; when like a man out of his wits, or rather possessed, he flies to the Devil to help him at a dead lift; and

and thus argues (for expreſs Scriptures have failed him long ago), from Matth. 24. *Satan therefore hath a kingdom, whereof he is chief.* And what then? One would think he ſhould have concluded, *Therefore ſo hath our Lord Chriſt.* But he was afraid of that; for he ſaw it would not do his buſineſs, but ours rather, who own Chriſt for the only Head of the Church. He tells us therefore (as if he had found it in the Text), There is but one viſible Head, even in Hell, as there is one viſible Head of the Church Triumphant in Heaven; and therefore why not a viſible Head on earth? He might as well have ask'd, Why not *one Univerſal Monarch* over all the Earth? Which is as reaſonable from theſe Principles, as *one viſible Head* of the Church. But to anſwer his queſtion plainly; There is no one viſible Head here, becauſe Chriſt the Head of the Church, both *Triumphant* and *Militant*, hath ordered it otherwiſe. *Having placed*, ſaith St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* XII. 28. in the Church, *firſt Apoſtles*; not *Peter*, or any one alone over the reſt, but the *Apoſtles* were left by Chriſt, the Supreme Power in the Church. XII Matt. 24.

Here I cannot but conclude, as that great and good Man Dr. *Jackſon* * doth, upon ſuch an occaſion: *Reader, Conſult with* * L. III. Chap. 7.

thy own heart, and give ſentence, as in the ſight of God; and judge of the whole Frame of their Religion by the Foundation; and of the Foundation (which is this Supremacy of Peter*) by the wretched Arguments whereby they ſupport it.*

For from the other Scriptures which follow in this Writer, their Arguments ſtand thus; *David* was made *Head of the Heathen* (XVIII. *Pſal.* 43.) therefore *Peter* was made Head of the Church. *Inſtead of the Fathers ſhall be thy Children, whom thou mayſt make Princes in all lands* (XLV. *Pſal.* 16.) therefore *Peter* ruled over all the reſt as a Prince. *Simon he ſirnamed Peter* (III. *Mark* 16.) therefore he had authority over all, becauſe named firſt. The ſame is gathered from I. *Act* 13 merely from the order of precedence, which muſt be granted to one or other, in a Body where all are equal. Finally, *Chriſt's kingdom ſhall have no end* (I. *Luke* 33.) therefore St. *Peter* muſt reign for ever in his Succeſſors. St. *Paul* was *not a whit behind the very chiefeſt Apoſtles*, (2 *Corinth.* XI. 5.) therefore what? common Reaſon would have concluded, therefore there were more chief Apoſtles beſides *Peter*; and St. *Paul* was not inferior to the greateſt of them, not to *Peter* himſelf. Theſe are

his

his Scripture-Arguments for their Supremacy.

And his *Fathers* affirm nothing at all of *Peter*, which is not ſaid of other Apoſtles. Particularly St. *Chryſoſtom* (who ſays no ſuch thing of *Peter*, as he makes him, in his 55th *Hom.* upon *Matthew*) expreſly ſays, *St.* Paul *governed the whole World as one Ship*, Hom. 25. upon 2 *Corinth.* and frequently calls *him*, as well as *Peter*, *Prince of the Apoſtles*: and calls them all *the Paſtors and Rectors of the whole World*, in his 2d *Hom.* upon *Titus*. And, to be ſhort, the Author of the imperfect Work upon St. *Matthew* (commonly aſcribed to St. *Chryſoſt.*) calls all Biſhops the *Vicars of Chriſt*. Hom 17. Finally, there is no Title ſo great, which is not given to others as well as *Peter*, by ancient Writers; even the Title of *Biſhop of Biſhops*, the name of *Pope*, *Holineſs*, *Bleſſed*, and ſuch like.

III. We

XII.

We hold, he saith,

That a Woman may be Head, or Supream Governess of the Church, in all Causes, as the late Queen Elizabeth *was.*

Answer.

NOne of us ever called Queen *Elizabeth* the *Head of the Church*: unless, as it signifies *Supream Governour.* And that indeed we assert she was, and all our Kings are, *of all persons whatsoever, in all Causes.* But because some leud People perverted the meaning of this, our Church took care to explain it in one of the *Articles of Religion*; that no man might mistake in the matter, unless he would wilfully, as this Writer doth; who could not but understand, that it is expresly declared, *Article* XXXVII. that *when we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief Government, we do not give to our Princes the ministring either of God's Word, or the Sacraments,* &c. *but that only Prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly*

godly Princes in the holy Scripture by God himself. That is, that they should rule all Estates and Degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal; and restrain with the Civil Sword, the stubborn and evil doers. This is our avowed Doctrine.

Now, what do our Bibles say against this? Nothing, but *a woman may not teach*, &c. 1 *Tim.* II. 12. And do not we say the same, that our Princes *may not minister the Word, or Sacraments?* What a shameless sort of People have we to deal withal; who face us down that we affirm what we flatly deny? And when he pretends faithfully to recite the words of our Bible, after *the New Translation* (as he doth in his Preface) here he gives us another Translation in the *second* Text he alledges, 1 *Cor.* XIV. 34. But take it as it is, it proves nothing but his folly and impudence; unless he could shew that Queen *Elizabeth* preached publickly in any of our Churches. But see the Childishness of this Writer, in alledging these Texts against the *Queen*, which make nothing against our *Kings*; who are not Women sure: And we ascribe the same power to them, which we did to her; and no more to her than belongs to them. 1 Tim. II. 12.

From

From Scripture he betakes himſelf to Reaſoning; which proceeds upon the ſame wilful, Miſtake we cannot call it, but, Calumny, (againſt our expreſs Declaration to the contrary) That we give our Kings ſuch an Headſhip, or Supream Power, as makes them capable to miniſter the Word and Sacraments. From whence he draws this new Slander, That many hundreds of them have been hang'd, drawn and quarter'd, for denying this Power. VVhereas every one knows the *Oath of Supremacy* is nothing elſe but a ſolemn declaration of our belief, that our Kings are the Supream Governors of theſe Realms, in all Spiritual things or Cauſes, as well as Temporal: and that no Foreign Prince or Prelate hath any Juriſdiction, Superiority, Preheminence, or Authority, Eccleſiaſtical or Spiritual, in theſe Realms, *&c.*

Now what can he find in his *Fathers* to oppoſe this? There were none of them, for above 800 years, who did not believe this; that *Emperors and Kings are next to God, and the Pope himſelf ought to be ſubject to them.* The words of *Optatus* ſpeak the ſenſe of them all; *There is none above the Emperor but God alone who made him Emperor.* And none

L. II. 1.

none can deny the Ancient Cuſtom to have been, that the Clergy and People of *Rome* having choſen the *Pope*, the Emperor confirmed or invalidated the Election as he pleaſed. *Adrian* indeed would fain have changed this Cuſtom, (*Anno* 811.) but ſtill it continued a long time, that the Election was not accounted valid, till the Emperor's Confirmation. And he cannot but know, (if he have read his own Authors) that after *Adrian*'s attempt, above forty Popes, from *John* IX. to *Leo* IX. were all created by the Emperors, who frequently alſo depoſed *Popes*. And *Popes* were ſo far from having any ſuch Authority over the Emperors, that when Pope *Gregory* VII. adventured upon it, it was eſteemed a *Novity*, not to ſay an *Hereſy*, (as *Sigebert*'s words are, *ad Anno* 1088.) which had not ſprung up in the World before.

But the Reader may here obſerve how well skill'd this Man is in the *Fathers*, who places *John Damaſcen* in the very front of them, who lived in the Eighth Century, and yet is ſet before *Theodoret* who lived in the Fifth, and St. *Chryſoſtome* who lived in the Fourth, nay, and before his *Ignatius*, who lived in the time of the Apoſtles; whoſe words import no more, but that *all*

muſt

must obey their Bishop as their Pastor; which agrees well enough with *the Bishop's obeying the Emperor as his Prince*. What *John Damascen* says, I cannot find; nor is there any thing of that nature in the place he quotes out of *Theodoret*. But *Valens* was an *Arian*, who commanded things contrary to the Christian Religion, and so was not to be obeyed. It is mere tittle-tatle about St. *Chrysostom*'s calling the Bishop a *Prince*, as well as a *King*; for a greater than he, *Constantine* the Great, in like manner calls himself a *Bishop*, as to all External Government.

XIII.

That Antichrist shall not be a particular Man; and that the Pope is Antichrist.

Answer.

THIS Proposition hath two Parts; neither of which are the *setled Doctrine* of our Church, or of any other Protestants; but the *Common Opinion* of all, some few exeepted. Especially the *first* Part,

Part, *That Antichriſt ſhall not be a particular Man*, but a Succeſſion of Men; which may be evidently proved from the Confeſſion of the ableſt Men in the *Roman* Church. For it is the Opinion of almoſt all their Interpreters, that the *laſt Head* mentioned by St. *John.* XVII *Rev.* 11. and called after a ſignal manner by the Name of *THE BEAST*, is no other than *Antichriſt.* Now all the forgoing *Heads* do not ſignify ſo many ſingle Perſons only; but all Expoſitors, ſaith their *Ribera* *, have underſtood that in every one of thoſe *Heads*, there are a great many comprehended. And never hath any man, but *Victorinus* taken them only for Seven ſingle Perſons, *whoſe Opinion ALL do deſervedly gainſay.* To the very ſame purpoſe, alſo *Alcaſar*, another famous *Roman* Expoſitor, writes upon the ſame place. And let this man, or any one elſe tell me, if they can, why the *laſt Head*, i. e. *Antichriſt*, as he is commonly called, ſhould not comprehend a Succeſſion of ſingle Perſons of the ſame ſort, as it is is manifeſt the *Beaſts* in *Daniel* ſignify. The *Ram*, for inſtance doth not ſignify *Darius* only, but the Ruling Power of *Perſia*, during that Kingdon. And the *He-goat*, not *Alexander* alone, but him and his Succeſſors, VIII. *Daniel* 4, 5.

* In XVII. Revel.

Now

Now from this ground, it may be plainly proved, (which is the *Second* thing) that the Ruling Power at this time in the *Roman Church* is *The Beast*, that is, *Antichrist*. For the *Beast* and *Babylon* are all one in this Vision; and by *Babylon* is certainly meant *Rome* (as their great Cardinal *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*, the best of their Authors, not only confess but contend). And not *Rome Pagan*, but *Rome Christian*, because she is called *the Great Whore*, XVII. *Rev.* 1. which always signifies, a People apostatized from true Religion to Idolatry; and because it is the same *Babylon*, which St. *John* saith, must be *burnt with fire*, Ver. 16. XVIII. 18. From whence *Malvenda*, another of their Authors, confesses it probable, that *Rome Christian* will be an *Idolatrous Harlot*, in the time of *Antichrist*; because it is to be laid desolate, it is manifest, for some Crime against the Church of Christ.

Now that this *Antichristian Power* ruling in that *Church*, is not to be adjourned to the end of the World, as they would fain have it, but is at this present; appears from hence, that the *Sixth HEAD* being that Power which reigned when St. *John* saw this Vision (XVII. *Rev.* 10.) there was but one *Ruling Power* more, and that to continue

nue but a short space, to come between the end of the *Sixth* HEAD, and this last HEAD or Power, called in an eminent sense, THE BEAST, v. 11. Now that *Imperial Power* which reigned at *Rome* in time of St. *John*, it is evident ended at the fall of the *Western* Empire with *Augustulus*; when another setled Authority was received by the City of *Rome* it self, instead of that former Imperial Government. Which new Authority lasting but a short space, as the Vision tells us, it is plain, THE BEAST, that is, *Antichrist*, is long ago in the Throne of the *Roman* Church. Let this Man, and all his Friends, try if they can answer this Argument, and see how they will free the *Papacy*, from being that *Antichristian Power*, which St. *John* foretold should arise, and make it self *drunk with the Blood of the Saints*. I am sure this is a stronger and clearer Explication of that Scripture, than any he hath attempted.

And now let us examine whether there be any thing in our Bible contrary to this. The *first* place he produces, 2 *Thess.* II. 3, *&c.* most evidently overthrows both parts of his Proposition; as I shall demonstrate. For the *Man of Sin*, and the *Son of Perdition*, v. 3. 2 Thess. II. 3.

is no more to be restrained to a single Person, than *he who now letteth*, v. 7. is to be restrained to a single Emperor. Now St. *Chrysostome* in plain terms saith, that the Apostle by the τὸ κατέχον, v. 5. *that which withholdeth* this Man of Sin from appearing, was the *Roman Empire*: And the ὁ κατέχων, v. 7, *he who now letteth*, the very same *Roman Power*, that is the *Roman* Emperors; not one particular Emperor, but the whole Succession of them, who as long as they lasted would keep back the Man of Sin. And this is not only his Sense (in his Comment upon the place) but the general Sense of the Ancient Fathers (*Tertullian*, *Lactantius*, *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, St. *Ambrose*, St. *Hierom*, and St. *Austin*, and a great number of *School-men* in the *Roman Church*) that *upon the fall of the* Roman *Empire*, *Antichrist shall come*. Which may satisfy any unprejudiced Man, both that *Antichrist* is come, and that he is not a *particular Man*, but a Succession of Men, who altogether make up one Person, called the *Man of Sin*, who can be none else but the *Papacy*. For what particular Man is there, to whom this can be applied, after the fall of the Empire?

His

His next place of Scripture, as he quotes it, is neither out of *our* Bible, nor out of *theirs* (ſo little is his *honeſty*). For thus the words run in both, *Let him that hath underſtanding count the number* (not *of a Man*, as he falſly tranſlates it, but) *of the Beaſt, for it is the number of a Man.* Now I have proved *the Beaſt* doth not ſignify a particular Man; and therefore this *Number*, whatſoever it is, ought not to be ſought only in one Man's name. Which is not the meaning of *the Number of a Man*, as this Man would have it; but ſignifies, as a better Interpreter than he (viz. *Arethas* out of *Andreas Cæſarienſis*) *A number, or counting, uſual and well known to Men.* And if we will believe *Irenæus*, (who in all probability was not the Inventor of it, but had it from the foregoing Doctors of the Church) it is to be found in the word Λατεῖνος, i. e. *Latin*, for ſaith he, *They are Latins who now Reign*; but we will not Glory in this. For it being the Common Opinion of the Church, the *Latin*, i. e. *Roman Empire* was that which hindred the appearance of *Antichriſt*; *Irenæus* might thence conclude, that Antichriſt ſhould reign in the Seat of that *Latine Empire*, when it was faln. And *Antichriſt* not being, as I have proved, *a*

XIII. Rev. 18.

L. V. cap. 30.

particular Man, this *Number* must be common unto all that make up that Antichristian Rule in the *Roman Church*. In which the *Popes* are all *Latins*; and they are distinguished from the *Greeks* by the Name of the *Latin* Church, and they have their Service still in the *Latin* Tongue; as if they affected to make good this Observation, that in them is found this *number of the Beast*. But I lay no great weight upon this Opinion of *Irenæus*, tho it will be very hard for them to confute it.

1 John II. 22. As to the 1 *John* II. 22. we do not say the *Pope* is the *Antichrist* there meant; and yet for all that, he may be the *Great Antichrist*. For it is to be observed, That St. *John* saith there, *v.* 18. that there were *many Antichrists* in his time; and *this Antichrist* who denied Jesus Christ to be come in the Flesh, or that *Jesus was the Christ*, was one of them; yet not a single Person, but a Body of Men; there being several Sects of them, under *Simon Magus*, *Cerinthus*, and the rest who belonged to this *Antichrist*. All which *Hereticks* their own Church acknowledges, were the forerunners of the *Great Antichrist*, whom we are seeking after, and can find no where but in the *Papacy*.

From

From hence he runs back again to the 2 *Theſſ.* II. 4. where thoſe very Characters, which he ſaith do not agree to the *Pope*, are thoſe whereby we are led to take him for *the Man of Sin.* He being manifeſtly, ὁ ἄνομος. *That wicked One*; we tranſlate it, who will be ſubject to *no Laws*; and *ſits in*, or *upon the Temple of God*, that is, the Chriſtian Church; where he *exalts himſelf over all that is called God*, that is, all Power on Earth; whom he makes ſubject to his decrees, which he would have received as the *Oracles of God*, and that by a blind Obedience againſt Mens reaſon; which is more than God himſelf requires of us. The Original of his Greatneſs was out of the Ruins of the *Roman Empire.* His coming was with *lying Wonders*; and (whatſoever this Man fancies) our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, tho not yet come, will come and certainly deſtroy him: *When the kingdoms of the world ſhall become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Chriſt, and he ſhall reign for ever*, XI. Rev. 15. 2 Theſſ II. 4, &c.

The laſt place upon which he adventures to diſcourſe, is V. *John* 43. where we have only his word for it, that when our Saviour ſaith, *If another ſhall come in his own Name*, he means, *eſpecially the wicked Anti-* V. John 43.

christ. Why him *especially*? Or him *at all*? And not rather any one, who should pretend to be the Christ? As several did (according to our Saviours Prediction, XXIV. *Matth.* 5.) such as *Theudas*, *Barchozba*, mentioned by *Josephus*, and another of the same Name in the time of the Emperor *Adrian*. And indeed there are such clear Demonstrations (which I have not room to mention) that this word *another* ought not to be restrained to one Single Person (such as they make the *Great Antichrist*) but signifies any body indifferently, who pretended to be the Christ; that we may well conclude those to be blinded, who make Christ have respect to the *Great Antichrist*, and from thence conclude the *Pope not to be that Antichrist*, because the *Jews* do not follow him. Alas! they see as little concerning *Antichrist*, as the *Jews* do of Christ (as was truly observed by an Eminent Divine of our own long ago). For as the *Jews* still expect the *Messiah*, who is already come, and was Crucified by their Fore-fathers; so they of the *Roman* Church look for an *Antichrist*, who hath been a long time revealed, and is reverenced by them as a God upon Earth. Thus Dr. *Jackson* *, who ventures to say further, That *he who will*

* Book III. *On the Creed*, Ch. 8.

will not acknowledge the Papacy *to be the Kingdom of* Antichriſt, *hath great reaſon to ſuſpect his heart, that if he had lived with our Saviour, he would ſcarce have taken him for his Meſſias* *.

* Ib. Chap. XXII. p. 452.

They that have a mind to *ſee more* of this Man's folly, may look into the other Scriptures, he barely mentions, where they will ſoon diſcover, how much they make againſt him.

What the Fathers ſay about this matter, I have already acquainted the Reader; which is ſo *poſitive* and *unanimous*, that it is ſufficient to overthrow what ſome of them ſay *conjecturally*. Particularly, upon the place laſt mentioned, V. *John* 43. concerning which they ſpeak with no *certainty*, as they do of the riſe of *Antichriſt* after the *Roman Empire* was removed out of the way, which gave the greateſt advantage to the Biſhop of *Rome* to advance himſelf unto that unlimited Power, which he hath uſurped over the Church of God. In ſhort, this Man hath ſtoln all his Authorities about this matter, out of *Feuardentius*'s Notes upon *Irenæus* *, where he makes this *alius*, *another*, to be *Antichriſt*; becauſe he is *alienus à Domino*; *an alien from the Lord*; which is not the right Character of *Antichriſt*, whom

* Lib. V. C. 25.

St. *Paul* makes to be no less than ἀντικείμενος, an *Adversary*, *who opposeth* our blessed Saviour. And to shew that this is a meer Accommodation, he adds in the next words, that he is the *unjust Judge*, whom Christ speaks of, *that feared not God, nor regarded Man.* If any one can think the *Fathers* intended to expound the Scripture, and to give us the express sense of it in such Speeches as these, he hath a very strange understanding.

XIV.

That no Man, nor any but God, can forgive, or retain Sins.

Answer.

THE strength of these Men lies only in their deceit and fraud. They dare not represent either their own Doctrine, or ours truly. For this Proposition, is both true and false, in divers regards. It is true, that none but God can *absolutely* and *sovereignly* forgive Sin: But it is false, that no Man can forgive Sins *Ministerially* and *Conditionally*. For by Authority from God,

Men

Men appointed thereunto do forgive Sins, as his Miniſters, by *Baptiſm*, by the *Holy Communion*, by *Preaching*, and by *Abſolution*. The only Queſtion is, Whether their Abſolution be only *declarative*, or alſo *operative?* And in this, if we be not all agreed, no more are they of the *Roman Church*. For *P. Lombard* did not believe that the Prieſt *wrought* any Abſolution from Sins; but only *declared* the Party to be abſolved. And the moſt Ancient Schoolmen follow him; ſuch as *Occam*, who ſays, *according to the Maſter, that Prieſts bind and looſe, becauſe they declare Men to be bound and looſed.* In ſhort, the Doctrine of the Church is, that *God abſolves by his Miniſters*; who cannot ſee into mens hearts; and therefore can only pronounce, that he abſolves them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, upon ſuppoſal of their unfeigned Repentance. But it is apparent the Church always believed, it is God who *properly* abſolves and forgives Sins, not the Prieſt. For all the Ancient *Rituals* ſhow that the Abſolution was given *by Prayer to God* for the Penitent, there being no other Form of Abſolution in them, but *Prayers*; which being made in behalf of the Penitent, they believed did obtain from God the pardon of thoſe Sins, which

which he had with all humility publickly confessed. And therefore the present form, *I absolve thee*, (which was never used but in the *Latin* Church, and not there neither, till the middle of the XIIIth. *Century*) must be understood to be only a very solemn declaration, That God forgives the person, upon his sincere Contrition and Repentance.

XX. John 21. This is the meaning of our Saviour, *John* 21. when he made the Apostles his Delegates, saying, *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.* Which supposes a superior Power to theirs, in whose Name they acted only as *Ministers*.

Ibid. v. 22, 23. And therefore when he adds in the next words, *v.* 22, 23. *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins ye remit, they are remitted*, &c. *Menochius* expounds it thus; That though the Holy Ghost was not given till the day of *Pentecost*, yet on the first day of the *Resurrection*, *they received the Grace of it, by which they might remit sins, and baptize, and make children of God, and give the Spirit of Adoption to them that believed*, &c. Now let any man tell me, whether it were *they* that, for instance, *gave the Spirit of Adoption*, or *God* himself; *they* that *healed* and *wrought Miracles*, (as they did after the day of *Pentecost*), or God by their Ministry. In like man-

manner, it was not *they* who conferred Forgiveneſs of Sins, but *God* properly beſtowed it, as he did the other Bleſſings; *they* only ſerving as Miniſters, by whom he conveyed it to the Penitent.

In the next place of Scripture he makes bold to add words, which are neither in our Bible, nor theirs, IX. *Matth.* 8. *When the multitude ſaw it*, (*i.* e. the man take up his bed and walk) *they marvelled and glorified God, which had given ſuch power unto men*, he adds, as to forgive ſins. Whereas the Evangeliſt ſpeaks of the power of healing a ſick man, which they *ſaw* plainly; and which our Saviour alledges as an Argument that he could forgive ſins; which the multitude could ſee no other way, but in this miraculous demonſtration of it. But ſuppoſe the multitude had admired at *his* Power to forgive ſins, will it follow that any body elſe hath that Power which *Chriſt* had? No; Chriſt could *as man*, forgive ſins, yet not *as any ſort of man*, (ſaith *Menochius* * himſelf), *but as God-man*; which no Prieſt whatſoever is.

* *Non ut qualiſcunq; homo, ſed ut homo Deus.*

He bids us, after his uſual form, *ſee more* in ſeveral Texts which he ſets down without the words; and we are very willing to obey him, if there were any thing to be ſeen

seen to this purpose: But the *two first* of them are only a promise of what our Saviour afterward bestowed; and we have heard what that was, from XX. *John* 23. The *two next* speak not of *forgiving sins*, nor merely of *retaining* them, but of *delivering men up to Satan*, which no body now can do.

2 Cor. II. 10. The next, 2 *Cor.* II. 10. proves too much, if it prove any thing to this purpose; for it speaks of the *whole Church* giving Pardon to an Offender, *viz.* by receiving him again, by the Apostles order, into their Communion.

V. 19. The next, 2 *Cor.* V. 19. relates to the Apostles reconciling men, *by preaching the Word* of God, as *Menochius* expounds it; or if by *Word of Reconciliation* we understand, saith he, the thing, that is, *Reconciliation it self*, then the Apostle speaks of *the whole Power and Ministry of reconciling men to God.* The last place out of V. *Numb.* 6. is as impertinent, as the quotations that follow out of the *Fathers*; which they have a little mended, since Bishop *Mountague* lash'd this Author severely for his childish and careless Transcriptions of them out of Father *Bellarmine.* You may judge of them all, by the *last* save one (which was the *first* heretofore) out of *Irenæus*, L. V. *c.* 13. who proving that we have a *Specimen* of the

the Reſurrection, in thoſe whom Chriſt raiſed from the dead, inſtances in *Lazarus*, unto whom he ſaid, *come forth*, and the dead man came forth bound hand and foot, *&c. A Symbol*, ſaith he, *or Type of that man, who is tyed and bound in ſins*; and with reſpect to this, the Lord ſaid, *Looſe him, and let him go.* But what good would their looſing him have done, if Chriſt had not firſt raiſed him from the dead? unto whoſe power, not theirs, all that followed is to be aſcribed. And to whom did Chriſt ſpeak, when he bad them looſe *Lazarus*, but to the *Jews* who were preſent? As *Maldonate*, one of their own good Writers expounds it, and ſaith, It is the opinion of all good Authors, except *Auſtin*, *Gregory*, and *Bede*; and adds, That to *found the Doctrine of Confeſſion or Abſolution upon this place, is no better than to build upon ſand.* But if it be ſuppoſed that he here ſpeaks to his Apoſtles, and bids them *looſe him*, ſtill it can *figure* no more, but a declaration of Pardon of Sins, granted already by the Mercy of the Almighty. What St. *Auſtin* therefore ſaith in the place which this man mentions *firſt*, is to no purpoſe; for it is the very ſame with this of *Irenæus*: For having ſaid in the beginning of that *Tractate* *, that the works

* *Tract.* XLIX. *in John.*

works of our Lord were not only *facta*, but *signa*, and showed how the three persons raised by him from the dead, signifie the raising up three degrees of sinners out of their sins: When he comes to this passage in the story of *Lazarus*'s Resurrection, *Loose him and let him go*; he saith, What is *loose him*, &c. but *what ye loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven*? And let it be so, that our Lord's words fitly represent this, yet still it was God that properly loosed men from their sins; the Apostles were but Ministers in this business, who declared what God had granted: As God raised up *Lazarus* from the dead, they only untied him, after he had really made him alive, and raised him out of his Grave.

All the rest out of the *Fathers*, is no better than this, and therefore I will not trouble the Reader with it, but pass to the next: Where he makes us say,

XV.

XV.

That we ought not to confess our sins to any man, but to God only.

Answer.

THis is a most impudent falshood; for we press this as a Duty in some cases, for the *quieting of mens Consciences*, when they are burdned with Guilt; particularly, before they receive the *Communion*, and when they are *sick*. But that which we affirm in this matter, is, That God doth not require all Christians to make a particular Confession, privately to a Priest, of every sin he hath committed, tho only in thought, *under pain of being damn'd*, if he do not. Much less do we believe such Confession to be *Meritorious*, and *Satisfactory* for sin. Nor do the Scriptures which he quotes, prove a syllable of this doctrine.

The first he alledges, III. *Matth.* 5, 6. speaks of those who confessed their sins, before they received Baptism of *John* the Baptist. But what is this to Confession of sins after Baptism? And besides, there is not a word of their confessing them to Matth. III. 5, 6.

John;

John; nor of particular Confession of *every* sin: And therefore *Maldonate* tells such raw Divines as this, *We ought not to rely upon this Testimony, for it is manifest it doth not treat of Sacramental Confession, which was not yet instituted.* And *Bellarmine*, their great Master, durst venture no further, than to call this, which was done at *John*'s Baptism, a *figure of their Sacramental Confession.* And this poor man himself concludes no more from hence, than this, That *we may confess our sins*, (who doubts of it?) *not only to God, but also to* man. But this is very short of what he undertook to prove by express Texts, That we *ought* to confess, *&c.*

Act. XIX. 18, 19. Nor dare he venture to conclude any more from the next place, but that we *may* confess our sins to men, XIX. *Acts* 18, 19. Where he bids us, *Behold, Confession*, but doth not tell us *to whom*: So we are never the wiser; because it might be to *God*, and that before all the *Company*, as the words seem to import. But he bids us also, *Behold Satisfaction*; because several people, (not the same he spake of before) brought forth their *curious* Books, which were worth a great deal of money, and burnt them *before all men.* A plain and publick demonstration indeed, that they detested those

those Magical Arts whereby they gave also satisfaction to *all men*, of their sincere renunciation of such wicked practices: But what proof is this of a *Compensation made to God* hereby for their Sins, which deserved of him an acquittance?

His *Third* Text is still more remote from the business, V. *Numb.* 6, 7. and therefore alledged by wiser heads than his, such as *Bellarmine*, only as a *figure* of Sacramental Confession; the least shadow of which doth not appear: For there is neither Confession of *all sins* here mentioned, but only of that particular for which the Sacrifice was offered; nor Confession of the sin *to the Priest*, but rather *to the Lord*, as the words more plainly signifie; *If a man or woman commit any sin that men commit, and do trespass against the* LORD, *and that person be guilty, then they shall confess their sin which they have done.* An unbiassed Reader would hence conclude, they were bound to confess their sin to the LORD, against whom they had trespassed. Numb. V. 6, 7.

His other Scriptures, perhaps, he was sensible, were nothing to the purpose; and therefore he only sets down the Chapter and Verse, as his manner is, when he bids, *See more*, where nothing is to be seen: For

the *first* is only the same we had out of St. *Matthew*. The next, V. *James* 16. speaks of one man's confessing his sins to his neighbour. The next we had before, under the former Head: And the *last* I am willing to think is mis-printed, or his mind was much amiss when he noted it, XVII. *Matth.* 14.

His *Fathers* also have only the word *Confession*, not saying, whether to God, or to man; and he thinks that enough: But it is a shameless thing to quote St. *Chrysostom* for this Doctrine; who in so many places exhorts his people only to confess their sins in private to God; that *Sixtus Senensis* is forced to expound him, as if he spake only against the necessity of such *Publick Confession*, as was abolished at *Constantinople*. But *Petavius* (who proves there was no such Publick Confession) is fain to desire the Reader to be so kind, as not to take St. *Chrysostom*'s words *strictly*, but spoken popularly, in a heat of declamation: And we are content to do so, if they would be so just as to do the same in other cases: But still we cannot think St. *Chrysostom* so very hot-headed, but that sometimes he would have been so cool, as to have spoken more cautiously, and not have so frequently overlasht, as they make him.

That

That which he quotes out of *Ambroſe*, he is told by *Bellarmine*, is *Greg. Nyſſen*; ſo little doth this poor man know of their own Authors. As for *his ſitting to hear Confeſſions*, (if his Author be worth any thing, which is much ſuſpected by Learned men of his own Communion) it is meant of *Publick Confeſſion*, ſuch as was in uſe in his time.

XVI.

That Pardons and Indulgences were not in the Apoſtles times.

Anſwer.

NOthing truer, by the Confeſſion of their own Authors; particularly *Antoninus* * in his Sums; *Of theſe we have nothing expreſly, neither in the Scriptures, nor out of the ſayings of the Ancient Doctors.* The ſame is ſaid by *Durandus*, and many others; who have been ſo honeſt as to confeſs, That ſuch *Indulgeuces* and *Pardons* as are now in uſe, are but of late invention: There being no ſuch thing heard of in the Ancient Church, as a *Treaſure of the Church, made*

* *Part* I. *Tit.* X *c.* 3.

up of the Satisfaction of Christ and of the Saints, out of which these Indulgences are now granted, for the profit of the dead, as well as of the living. Whereas of old they were nothing but *Relaxations of Canonical Penances*, when long and severe Humiliations had been imposed upon great Offenders; which sometimes were thought fit to be remitted, upon good considerations, either as to their severity, or as to their length. Now this, which was done by any Bishop, as well as he of *Rome*, we are not against. But such Indulgences are in these ages of no use, because the *Penitential Canons* themselves are relaxed, or rather laid aside, and no such tedious and rigorous Penances are inflicted; which the Church of *Rome* hath exchanged for *Auricular Confession*, and a slight *Penance* soon finished

The *first* place he produces out of our Bible to countenance their Indulgences, we had before to prove *men may forgive sins*, *Sect.* XIV. and others have alledged it to prove *men may satisfie for their sins*; now it is pressed for the service of *Indulgences*. What will not these men make the Scripture say, if they may have the handling of it? But after all, this will not serve their purpose; for the *Pardon* the Apostle here

2 Cor. II. 10.

here speaks of, was nothing but the restoring him again to Christian Communion, who had been thrown out of the Church. But is this the *Indulgence* they contend for in the Church of *Rome*? Will this serve their turn? Then every Church hath as much power as this comes to; and the whole body of the Church will have a share in this power of *Indulgences*: For St. *Paul* speaks to all the *Corinthian* Christians in general, that they should forgive him.

And so he doth also in the *next* place here alledged, *v.* 6, 7. of the same Chapter; which speak of a Punishment inflicted ed *by many*; which he tells them ought not to be continued, but contrarywise, *Ye ought to forgive him, and comfort him*, &c. Upon which words hear what your *Menochius* says, *This Punishment was publick Separation from the Church, out of which he was ejected by* MANY, i. e. *by you all, with detestation of his Wickedness*, &c. *The forgiveness* of which, was taking him into the Church again, as *Theodoret* expounds the next words, v. 8. *Unite the member to the body; joyn the sheep together with the flock; and thereby show your ardent affection to him.* Ibid. v. 6, 7.

He bids us *see more* in two other places of Scripture, which we have examined before for other purposes, but he would have serve for all: A sign they have great scarcity of Scripture-proofs; and therefore he gives us a larger Catalogue of Fathers; which he packs together after such a fashion, as no Scholar ever did. For after *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, who speak only of the forenamed *Relaxation of Canonical Censures*, he mentions the Council of *Lateran*, but doth not tell us which; though if he had, it would have been to no end: For the first *Lateran* Council was above *Eleven hundred* years after Christ: And *Innocent* III. who is his next *Father*, lived an *hundred* year later; holding the IV*th*. *Lateran* Council, 1215. After these he brings St. *Ambrose*, *Austin*, *Chrysostome*, who lived 800 years before, and knew of no *Indulgences*, but such as I have mentioned. *Lastly*, He tells us, *Urban* the second granted a Plenary Indulgence; and when lived this holy Father, do you think? Almost eleven hundred years after Christ, *Anno* 1086. A most excellent proof, that the *Romish Indulgences* were in use in the *Apostles times*. Can one think that such men as this, expect to be read by any but fools? who perhaps may imagine this *Urban*

ban was contemporary with the *Apostles*. It is some wonder he did not quote that holy Father *Hildebrand*, Greg. VII. who something before this, granted *Pardon of Sins* to all those who would take up Arms against his Enemies. Poor man! he did not know this, else he would have mentioned him rather than *Urban*, who was but his Ape.

The Protestants hold (if you will believe him),

XVII.

That the Actions and Passions of the Saints, do serve for nothing to the Church.

Answer.

A Most wicked Slander; for we look upon what they did and suffered, as glorious Testimonies to the Truth they believed and preached, as strong incitements to us to follow their Examples, and as eminent Instances of the Power of God's Grace in them; for which we bless and praise *him*, and thankfully commemorate them.

But all this *serves for nothing to the Church*, that is, *to the Church of* Rome; unless men believe there is a *Treasury* which contains all the *superfluous Satisfactions* of the Saints, who suffered more than they were bound to endure. Of which vast Revenue *that Church* having possessed it self, *it serves* to bring abundance of Money into their Coffers; which must be paid by those who desire to be relieved out of these *superabundant Satisfactions* of the Saints, by having them applied to them, for the supply of their defects. This is the meaning of this very man, it appears, by the Scriptures he quotes for *their* belief.

I. Col. 24. The *first* is, I. *Col.* 24. which speaks of the Persecutions St. *Paul* endured, in Preaching the Gospel to the *Colossians*; which tho grievous to him, was so beneficial to them, that he rejoiced in his Sufferings, and resolved to endure more for the confirmation of their Faith, and for the edification of the Church of Christ. This he calls, *filling up what was behind of the afflictions of Christ*: Because Christ began to testifie to the Truth, by shedding of his Blood, and thence is called *the Faithful Witness:* But it remained still, that the Apostles should give their Testimony by the like Sufferings, be-

becauſe the Goſpel was to be carried to the *Gentile* World; which could not be effected without their enduring ſuch hardſhips, as Chriſt had endured in Preaching to the *Jews*. Thus *Theodoret* expounds, *That which was behind*, or *which remained of the Affliction of Chriſt*. But here is not a word of *Satisfaction*; no, not by Chriſt's Sufferings, which were of ſuch value, that there was nothing of this nature left to be done by others. This, better Men than this, of their own Church, ingenuouſly confeſs. Particularly, *Juſtinianus*, a Jeſuit, whoſe words are theſe upon this very place, *He ſaith he filled up what was wanting of the Paſſion of Chriſt, not to merit indeed, or make Satisfaction (for what can be wanting to that which is Infinite?) but as to the Power and Efficacy of bringing Men to the Faith; that his Myſtical Body, which is the Church, may be perfected*, &c. For he ſignifies in the latter end of the Verſe, That *he ſuffered for the enlarging or propagating of the Church, to confirm and eſtabliſh its faith, that he might provoke others to his imitation.*

I could add many more, to ſhew the Folly of this Man; who ſaith, *From hence Ground hath always been taken for Indulgences.* A notorious falſhood; not *always*, for Indulgences are late things; not by *all Men* in

in their Church, since it used them. For *Estius* in his Notes upon this place, absolutely disclaims it, and saith, Tho some Divines hence argue that the Passions of the Saints are profitable for the remission of sins, which is called Indulgence; yet he doth not think this to be solidly enough concluded from this place.

Which I have been the longer about, because they are wont to make a great noise with it. The next place they curtail'd heretofore in this manner; *He was nigh unto Death, not regarding his Life, to supply your lack* (leaving out what follows, *of service towards me*) which made it sound something like, as if their *lack of Goodness* had been supplied by his *Merits*, or rather *Satisfaction:* for Merit will do no service in this case. But Bishop *Montague* bang'd them so terribly for this foul play, that now they have printed it right; tho, alas! nothing to the purpose. And therefore this Man doth not venture to say so much as one word upon this Text; but barely recites the words, and leaves the Reader to make what he can of them. And all that *Menochius*, a truly Learned Expositor of their own, could make of them, is this, 'That 'St. *Paul* being in Prison, *Epaphroditus* performs,

Philip. II. 30.

'forms him thoſe good Offices, which the '*Philippians* ſhould have done, had they not 'been abſent: But he ſo much neglected 'himſelf, while he was wholly intent upon 'ſerving the Apoſtle, that he fell danger-'ouſly ſick, and lay for a time without hope 'of Life.

Finding ſo little relief in theſe places of Scripture, he betakes himſelf to arguing from that Article of our Creed, *The Communion of Saints.* Which *Bellarmine*, from whom he borrows theſe goodly proofs, manages on this manner, *We are taught by this Article, that all the Faithful are Members of one another, being a kind of living Body. Now as living Members help one another, ſo the Faithful communicate good things among themſelves; eſpecially when thoſe which are ſuperfluous to the one, are neceſſary or profitable to the other.* L. 1. *de Indulg.* c. 3.

This is admirable Catholick Doctrine. The *Saints* have more than they need, and therefore they communicate it to us, for the ſupply of our wants. But this ſhould have been proved, and not ſuppoſed, that the *Saints* have more than enough, ſomething to ſpare; and that their Paſſions were *Satisfactions*, and *Superabundant Satisfactions.* After which it would ſtill remain a pretty

a pretty undertaking to prove, that because one Member helps another when it suffers any thing; therefore the *Sufferings* of one Member will *Cure* another Member; the Pain, for instance, of the long Finger will free the little Finger from the pain which it it suffers. Thus the Actions and Passions of *Saints* are not imparted to us; as this Man presumes from the Relation we have one to another; and yet they serve for very good purposes to the Church, as I have already shown.

And one would imagine he distrusted this Argument after he had set it down, because he runs back again to the Scriptures. A great Company of which he heaps up, to no more purpose than if he had quoted so many Texts of *Aristotle*. I will give the Reader a taste of one or two: The *first* is, CXIX. Psalm 63. *I am a companion of all them that fear thee, and of them that keep thy precepts.* Thus the words run expressly in our Bible. Now let me beseech the Reader to consider what *Action or Prayer of the Church Triumphant, for the Church Militant or Patient, or for both*, he can find contained in this Text, as he saith there is in *all the Passages* he quotes. Let him look into the next, and I will be his Bond's man, if he

he meet with a word of any *Action or Prayer of the Church Triumphant*; but only mention of *many Members*, which make up but *one Body*, 1 *Cor.* XII. 12. And what *Action or Prayer of the Church Triumphant*, can one gather out of St. *Paul*'s *care for all the Churches*, 2 *Cor.* XI. 28. As for LIII. *Iſaiah*, the Church always thought it a Prophecy of the Sufferings of *Chriſt*, and not of the *Saints*; and ſo the Apoſtles interpret it in many places. If he mean, LIII. *Pſalm* 9. (as one Edition of his Book hath it) there are not ſo many Verſes in it; and we ſhould be as far to ſeek for any ſenſe, if we ſhould *ſee more*, and therefore I will look no further.

What the Fathers affirm, he bids us alſo *ſee*, but doth not tell us; and I cannot truſt him ſo much, as to think it worth my pains to look into the places, to which he points us. St. *Auſtin*, I am ſure (the *firſt* he names) is abuſed by him; who hath not a word of this matter in his *Second* Chapter of his Book, about *the Care of the Dead*; which is altogether concerning this Queſtion, *Whether the Dead ſuffer any thing for want of Burial?* Upon the LXI. *Pſalm* indeed (which he quotes at laſt) he mentions that place of St. *Paul*, 1 *Coloſſ.* 24.

and

and discourses how Christ suffered not only in his own Person, but in his Members; every one of which suffers what comes to his share; and all of them together fill up what is wanting of the Sufferings of Christ. So that none hath *Superabundant* Sufferings; but he expresly saith, That we every one of us, *Pro modulo nostro*, according to our small measure, *Pay what we owe*, (mark that, *not more* than we are obliged unto, which is the *Romish* Doctrine, but what we are bound unto) *and to the utmost of our Power we cast in, as it were, the stint or measure of Sufferings, which will not be filled up* till the end *of the World.* Which is directly against what this Man, and his Church, would have: For they that bring in but their share, and nothing more than they owe, have no *redundant Passions*, out of which flow *superfluous Satisfaction.*

XVIII.

XVIII.

That no Man can do Works of Supererogation.

Anſwer.

HOW ſhould he? When no Man can *Supererogate* till he have firſt *erogated*. In plainer terms, no Man can have any thing to ſpare, to beſtow upon others (for this they mean by *Supererogating*) till he hath done all that is bound to do for himſelf. And therefore Biſhop *Andrews* * well calls theſe works of Supererogation, *proud pretences* of doing more than a man needs; when he hath not done all he ought. For theſe *two* things are neceſſary to make ſuch Works, as they mean by this word. *Firſt*, That a Man have done all that God's Law commands. *Secondly*, That he have done ſomething which it commandeth not. But who is there that hath done all which God's Law requires? That is, who is without all Sin? Therefore, who can by doing ſome voluntary things, to which he is not bound, do above his Duty, when he falls ſo much below it, in things expreſly

* Reſp. ad Apolog. Bellarmini, p. 196.

presly commanded? There is *another* great flaw also in this Doctrine; for they suppose precepts to require a lower degree of Goodness, and counsels a more high or excellent. Which is false, for Gods Precepts require the heigth of Virtue; and Councils only show the means whereby we may more easily, in some circumstances, attain it. As forsaking all, keeping Virginity, are not perfections; but the Instruments of it, as they may be used.

The places which he brings to prove men may do such works, are first, XIX. *Matth.* 21. Where there is not a word of doing any thing which might be bestowed upon others; but only of laying up treasure to himself in Heaven, by doing a thing extraordinary. We do not say, all things are commanded, but some are counselled; yet there are men of great Name in the Church (such as St. *Chrysostome*, and St. *Hilary*) who call this a Commandment which Christ gave the young man. And so it is, if he would *come and follow* Christ, that is, be one of his constant attendants, as the Apostles were, who had left all, that they might give up themselves wholly to his Service.

XIX. Mat. 21.

The

The next is no more to the purpose, 1 *Cor.* VII. 25. for no body thinks there is any command to live single; but it was a prudent Counsel of the Apostle at that time, when the Church was in great distress; which made it adviseable for People, if they could, to keep themselves single, whereby they would shift the better, and be freed from a great many Cares and Troubles of this Life. But he doth not say, that hereby they would lay up a Treasure of *Satisfactions*, which would serve more than themselves, and might be bestowed upon others. This is the meaning of the *Roman* Church. 1 Cor. VII. 25.

The *third*, XIX. *Matth.* 12. hath no more in it, than the two former. It is a Counsel, *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.* But they who received it, did not thereby make Satisfaction for defects in obedience to God's precepts; muchless, did they do so much as to have to distribute unto others. Let who will look into the other Scriptures, which he barely notes, he will find them as empty as these; especially the first of them, X. *Luke* 25. which contains only a question propounded to our Saviour by a tempting Lawyer: Unless he means the Answer to it, which is a Com- XIX. Mat. 12. X. Luke 25.

mand for *loving God with all the Heart, and all the Soul*, &c. And it is not left at our liberty, I hope, whether we will thus love him or no.

Not one of his *Fathers* say what he would have them. The first of them, St. *Ambrose*, only says, He that obeys a *Counsel* (for instance, sells all his Goods to follow Christ) may say more than he that obeys only a *Precept*. For he may expect a reward, as the Apostles did, when they said, *Behold, we have left all and followed thee; what therefore shall we have?* Whereas they that do what they are commanded, must say, *We are unprofitable servants, and have but done our Duty*. Now, what doth this Discourse prove? But that they shall have a greater reward themselves? but there is not a syllable of their *supererogating* for others. Nor in *Origen*, nor *Eusebius*, much less St. *Chrysostome*, whose business it is to prove, that *God's Commands are not impossible*. What is this to Counsels? Of which *Gregory the Great* indeed (not *Greg. Nyssen*, who hath no such Work) speaks in his *Morals*; but is so far from maintaining *works of Supererogation*, that none can be more express than he for the *Protestant* Doctrine; Of *the imperfection of all mens righteousness, and renouncing all confidence in our own Merits*.

XIX.

XIX.

That by the fall of ADAM, *we have all loſt our Free-will; and that it is not in our Power to chuſe Good, but only Evil.*

Anſwer.

THIS is another inſufferable Slander in the *firſt part* of it; for if we had all loſt our freedom of will, we ſhould be no longer Men. We only ſay, we have not ſuch a freedom of Will as we formerly had, and ſo all ſay. And he that ſays, (which is the *ſecond Part* of this Propoſition) *It is in our power to chuſe that which is Good*, without the aſſiſtance of Grace, is a *Pelagian*, that is, an *Heretick*; as this Man is, by contradicting what we affirm, That *it is not in our power* (that is, our natural ſtrength) *to chuſe Good*, that is, Spiritual Good; of which, if he do not ſpeak, he only babbles. *For the will of Man* (ſaith *Bellarmine* * himſelf) *in things appertaining to Piety and Salvation, can do nothing without the aſſiſtance of God's Grace; yea, without his ſpecial aſſiſtance.* This is the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and

* L. VI. de lib. arbitr. & gratia, c 4.

is our Doctrine in the Tenth Article of our Religion, unto which he hath nothing to oppose.

For not one of his places of Scripture prove, Man hath a Power of himself to will what is good, without God's Grace. His

1 Cor. VII. 37. *first* Scripture, 1 *Corinth.* VII. 37. speaks of a thing that is neither *Good* or *Evil* in it self; but *indifferent*; for no man is bound *to Marry*, or *not to Marry*; but it may be as he pleases, either way. Yet it is manifest by the very Text, that the Apostle supposes some Men have not a power to contain; and so, in their case Marriage becomes necessary.

As to what he intermixes with this, (which is very foreign to it) *My Son, give me thy heart*; let me demand of him, whether any man can consent to this, unless God draw his heart to him, when he asks a man to give it? And he that is drawn,

* L. III. adv. Pelag. saith St. *Hierom* *, doth not run spontaneously of himself, but *he is brought to it, when he either draws back, or is slow, or unwilling.* But I will not abuse the Reader's time in so much as mentioning the rest; since we say nothing in this matter, but what the *Gospel*, what the Ancient *Fathers*, particularly St. *Austin*, say, nay, what *Bellarmine* himself

ſelf confeſſes to be true; whoſe words in the concluſion of this Controverſy, fully expreſs our ſenſe, and give an anſwer to all that this man fooliſhly as well as falſly charges us withal.

The Converſion of Man to God, as alſo every other good work, as it is a WORK (that is, an human act) *is only from his free Will, yet not excluding God's general help; as it is* PIOUS, *it is from Grace alone; as it is a* PIOUS WORK, *it is both from our free Will, and from Grace.* To this we ſubſcribe. L. VI. De Grat. & Lib. Arbit. c. 15. Decima ſent.

XX.

That it is impoſſible to keep the Commandments of God, tho aſſiſted with his Grace, and the Holy Ghoſt.

Anſwer.

THIS is ſuch a down-right Calumny, that I cannot but ſay with the Pſalmiſt, *What ſhall be done unto thee, O thou falſe Tongue?* We moſt thankfully acknowledg the Power of the Divine Grace

to be so great, that it is possible for us to keep God's Commandments, *to such a degree as he requires and accepts*; *tho not with such an exact and strict obedience, as to stand in no need of his gracious Pardon of our defects.*

Phil. IV. St. *Paul* means no more, when he saith, he could do *all things*, that is, *all before mentioned, and harder things yet, if occasion were, by the help of Christ, who administred strength to him, to do all those things*, as *Menochius* interprets it. IV. *Philip.* 13.

I. Luke 5, 6. Nor doth St. *Luke*'s Character of *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*, amount to more than this, that they were *sincerely good* People; who were therefore *Blameless*, or *Irreprehensible*, (as *Menochius* translates it) because, saith *Theophylact*, they acted *out of pure respect to God, and not to please Men.* For many walk in the Law of God, who are not irreprehensible, because they do all to be seen of men. But *Zachary* both did what God commanded, and did it irreprehensibly; not performing such things that he might please men. Thus he, and St. *Austin* gives another reason of this, glossing upon the Virgins mention'd *Revel.* XIV. *In whose mouth was found no guile, because they were irreprehensible* (as he renders the

the word, we (tranſlate, *without fault*) *before the Throne of God: They were*, ſaith he, *therefore without reprehenſion, becauſe they faithfully reprehended themſelves; and therefore guile was not found in their mouth; becauſe if they had ſaid, they had no ſin, they had deceived themſelves.* It is plain by this, they did not look upon ſuch perſons as *without all ſin*, but only *ſincere and intire in their obedience* to Chriſt's Commands. Nay, it is evident *Zachary* himſelf, whom St. *Luke* ſo highly commends, was not thus *blameleſs*, as to be without all ſin; for he was much to blame in not believing the Angel, who brought him a meſſage from God, and was puniſhed for not believing it, by being ſtruck dumb till the Angel's word was fulfilled.

All his other *Scriptures* therefore, and *Fathers*, proving that which none of us deny, are here alledged in vain.

He next of all ſaith, we maintain,

XXI.

That Faith only justifieth; and that Good Works are not absolutely necessary to Salvation.

Answer.

WHat shall one do with a man that oppoſeth he knows not what? The *first part* of this Propoſition is St. *Paul*'s, who in effect ſaith the ſame, III. *Rom.* 28. II. *Gal.* 16. Therefore no man ſhould be ſo bold as to contradict it, but rather explain it; which it is eaſie to do; for when we ſay, *Faith only juſtifies*, this *Faith* includes in it a ſincere purpoſe of good living; without which, we believe it will not juſtifie. And therefore the *ſecond part* of it is a new ſlander, That we affirm *Good works are not neceſſary to Salvation*; the direct contrary to which, we heartily believe: For *it is abſolutely neceſſary to our Salvation*, we all affirm, *that we act according to our Faith*; tho by ſuch Good works, we can merit nothing, neither *Juſtification*, nor *Salvation*: But *we are accounted righteous before God, only for*

for the merits of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; by Faith, not for our own works or deſerving, as the words are in the XI*th.* Article of our Religion. So that when we ſay, *by Faith,* it is manifeſt we exclude not *Good works,* but only *the merit* of them. And thus *Luther* himſelf ſhows (upon V. *Gal.*) That *Faith alone will not ſuffice, tho Faith alone juſtifies.*

Therefore all his Scriptures might have been ſpared, eſpecially the firſt of them, 1 *Cor.* XIII. 2. which ſpeaks of a *miraculous Faith*; and beſides, doth not contradict us, who believe Faith without works will not avail to Salvation; though let us do never ſo much, we can never merit it by what we do. 1 Cor. XIII. 2.

The *ſecond* Text, II. *Jam.* 24. is agreeable to what we ſay, That *the Faith which juſtifies, includes in it a purpoſe of well-doing.* Such an one as was in *Abraham,* whoſe Faith, in purpoſing to offer up *Iſaac,* was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs, tho he had not actually done as he purpoſed to do. In like manner, if any man ſincerely profeſs the Chriſtian Faith, and be baptized, he is juſtified, tho he have not as yet brought forth the fruit of it in good works; (witneſs the *Eunuch,* VIII. *Acts* 37.) which James II. 24.

if

if he should not produce afterward, he could not be saved. St. *Austin* in that very Book and Chapter which he quotes, expressly saith, *Good Works follow him that is justified, they do not precede him that is to be justified.* What doth he think of the Thief upon the Cross, who only believed, and was not so much as baptized?

II *James* 14. is not contrary to what we say, but according to it. Mr. *Calvin* himself upon these very words, saith, *Therefore we are saved by Faith, because it joins us to God; which is done no other way, but that living by his Spirit, we be governed by him.* St. *Paul* and St. *James* agree very well; though the one say, *We are not justified by Faith only*, (which is St. *James*'s Doctrine); and the other, St. *Paul*, in effect says, We are justified by Faith only, when he saith, *We are justified by Faith, without Works.* As he shows in *Abraham*'s case; where he opposes Justification *by Faith*, and Justification *by Works*; and affirms *Abraham* was not justified by Works, but by Faith. St. *James* alledging the same case, and the very same words, proves he was justified by Works, and *not by Faith only.* Can any one think they make use of the same instance, for quite contrary ends? It is a wonder men

do

do not learn this plain and easie truth from hence; That Faith alone (having in it a purpose of well-doing) enters us into the state of Justification, before we have done what we purpose; but Good Works are necessary to continue us in this state, and so may be said to justifie us; that is, continue our Justification, which *Faith only* cannot do.

The *last* place, V. *Gal.* 6. we have noted so well, that we expresly declare in our XIIth. Article, That *Good works cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's Judgment*, (these are the great things we deny) *yet they do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith.* And the Doctrine of St. *Austin** is perfectly ours; which I will set down, because it explains all that I have said: *A good life is inseparable from Faith; yea, in truth, Faith it self is a good life.* And again*; 'How can he that is justified by 'Faith, chuse but work Righteousness? 'But if any man, when he hath believed, 'presently depart this life, the Justification 'of Faith remains with him; no good 'work *preceding*, because he came to it, not 'by Merit, but by Grace; nor *following*, 'because he was not suffered to remain in 'this life. From whence it is manifest 'what

* *L. de Fide & Operib. c.* 14.

* *Lib. Quest.* 83. *q.* 76.

'what the Apostle saith, *We conclude a man 'is justified by Faith without works.*

All his other Scriptures therefore serve only to shew his Ignorance, if not his Malice, in charging us with the denial of that which we affirm, That *good works are necessary to Salvation.* His *Fathers* he had better have kept to himself; for they frequently say, *Faith only justifies.* Even *Origen* *, upon that very Book, the Epistle to the *Romans*, affirms, that *Justification of Faith alone suffices, tho a man hath not done any works.* Which he proves by the example of the *Thief upon the Cross*; and the Woman in VII. *Luke*, to whom our Saviour said, *Go in peace, thy Faith hath saved thee.* 'But perhaps, saith 'he, some reading this, may think he may 'neglect to do well, since Faith alone suf-'ficeth to Justification. To whom we say, 'That if any man doth wickedly after Ju-'stification, without doubt he despiseth the 'Grace of Justification. Neither doth a 'man receive Forgiveness of sins for this, 'that he may think he hath a License given 'him to sin again; for a Pardon is given 'him, not for sins to come, but for sins that 'are past. And what he saith upon the 'next Chapter, (not the V*th.* as this man 'quotes him, but the IV*th.*) doth not con-'tradict

* *In Cap.* III.

'tradict this; *Faith cannot be imputed to thoſe 'who believe in Chriſt, but do not put off the 'old man with his unrighteous acts.* Which very well agrees with what he ſaid before, and we with him: Faith enters us into a ſtate of acceptance with God; but we cannot go to Heaven, unleſs we bring forth the fruit of Faith in new Obedience. So he explains himſelf moſt excellently, in that very place, a little before, in theſe words, which comprehend the whole buſineſs: *I think that the firſt beginnings, and the very foundations of Salvation, is Faith; the progreſs and increaſe of the building, is hope; but the perfection and top of the whole work is Charity.* I will not trouble the Reader with what the reſt of his *Fathers* ſay, ſince they themſelves are ſenſible their Cauſe is endangered by the *Fathers*. Which is ſo notorious, that they have taken care to have this paſſage expunged out of the very *Index* of St. *Auſtin*'s works * upon the Pſalms, *Through Grace we are ſaved by Faith*; tho St. *Paul* affirms the ſame, II. *Epheſ.* 8. And out of the very Text of St. *Cyril* upon *Iſaiah*, theſe words are ordered to be expunged (by the *Spaniſh Index* of *Gaſp. Quiroga*) *the Grace of Faith is ſufficient to the cleanſing of ſin*; and Chriſt *dwells in our heart by Faith.* No wonder

* Printed 1543. *apud Ambr. Girau.*

In I. Iſa. *& in* 51.

der then they have dealt thus with later Authors of theirs own, who followed the *Fathers* Doctrine; particularly with *Vatablus*, out of whose Annotations upon VIII. *Isa* 32. they have ordered these words to be blotted out, *They that beliive in the Lord, shall be saved; but they that do not, shall perish.* And these upon VIII. *Luk. Faith saveth.*

XXII.

That no Good Works are Meritorious.

Answer.

AT last he speaks some truth, tho very lamely. For if by *meritorious* were meant nothing, but that good works are highly valued by God, when performed out of love to him, and we deny our selves to serve him; which undoubtedly he will reward with a glorious Recompence, tho far transcending our services; there would be no quarrel about this matter. But by *works meritorious*, they mean such as are no ways defective, and have such an exact proportion to the Reward, that God is bound in strict Justice, to bestow, or rather pay

pay it. Now this is it we deny, believing that *Good works in the rigour of Justice, do not deserve eternal life as wages*; and this is it which they presume, but can never prove.

His *first* Text, XVI. *Matth.* 17. is so far from *express*, that quite contrary it saith, God will only reward every man *according to his works*, not *for the merit of his works*; which imports them to be an adequate cause; whereas *according*, signifies nothing of a *cause*, but only of a *respect*, or comparison between the work and the reward; so that they who have done evil shall be punished, and they that have done good be blessed. And he belies St. *Austin* (according to the manner of their Catholick Sincerity) to justifie his Interpretation. For St. *Austin* speaks of the Punishment of Sinners, not of the Reward of the Righteous. *I beseech you, brethren, attend diligently, and be ye afraid as well as I, for he doth not say He will render to every one according to his mercy, but according to their works*, (he saith not a word of *their Faith*, which this man put in of his own head) *for now he is merciful, but then just.* Would to God they would take St. *Austin*'s counsel, and so diligently attend to this, as to repent of their shameless Forgeries, that they may find

XVI. Mat. 17.

Serm. XXXV. *de verbis Apost.*

find Mercy with God, which hereafter will be denied.

The word for *Reward* in V. *Matth.* 12. is not to be interpreted, *Wages*, and *Hire*, due to the work. For the Labourers who came at the Eleventh Hour into the Vineyard, as St. *Hilary* * observes, received *Mercedem*, their Reward, *not of the work, but of Mercy*: Which is exactly according to St. *Paul*, IV. *Rom.* 4. where he saith, there is a μισθὸς, (which this man would have translated, *Wages*), *Reward* of *Grace*, not of *Debt*. Which place St. *Austin* * having occasion to mention, thus glosses; *Now to him that worketh*, that is, presumeth of his Works, and saith that for their merit the Grace of Faith was given, *the Reward is not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt*. What's this, *but that our Reward is called Grace? If it be Grace, it is freely given. What's meant by freely given? It cost thee nothing. Thou didst no good, and Remission of sins is bestowed upon thee.* I have quoted this at large, that if it be possible, such men as this may be put to the blush, if not confounded. As one would expect they should be, when they read St. *Paul*; who tho he say, Death is the *wages* of sin, yet saith, Eternal Life is the *Gift* of God: Which the *Fathers* take great

* *In* Psal. 129. *in fine.*

* *In* Psal. XXXI.

great notice of, particularly St. *Hierom*; he doth not ſay, the *wages of Righteouſneſs*, as he had ſaid the *wages of ſin*; for *eternal life is not earned by our labour, but graciouſly beſtowed by God's gift.*

The ſame Anſwer ſerves for the next place, X. *Matth.* 42. and all ſuch Texts. And 2 *Cor.* V. 10. was anſwered before; that we ſhall receive *according* to what we have done in the body; they that have done well ſhall be rewarded above their deſerts; and they that have done evil, receive what they have deſerved: Which is the higheſt encouragement unto well-doing; to believe, That God will do more abundantly for us, out of his infinite bounty, than we can ask or think; and not conſider our merits (which are none at all) but his own incomprehenſible Goodneſs and Mercy. They that teach otherways, derogate from the Grace of God, and proudly arrogate to themſelves a worthineſs, of which creatures are not capable.

I need not examine that heap of Scriptures, which he confuſedly huddles together; for they have no more in them than theſe we have already conſidered. And as for the *Fathers*, it is a moſt inſufferable impudence to ſay, as he doth, That they

unanimously confirm the same. The quite contrary hath been unanswerably proved by our Writers, That the *Fathers* from the first times, down to Venerable *Bede*, have taught as he doth, That *no man ought to think his own merits will suffice him to salvation; but let him understand, That he must be saved by the sole Grace of God* *.

* In Psal. 31.

It is frivolous to alledg the word *Merit*, so often used by the *Fathers*; for they mean no more thereby, but *obtaining* that which they are said to merit. So the word is used in innumerable places, and in many Authors: Insomuch, that in the Passion of St. *Maximilian*, it is said, his Mother, after he was killed, *merited his Body of the Judge*; that is, she obtained it by her Intreaties. Every Novice in Learning knows this.

XXIII.

Faith once had, cannot possibly be lost.

Answer.

IT was not possible for him to go on to speak some Truth; but he returns to his old way of Calumniating: For there is

is no ſuch Poſition maintained among us, but expreſly the contrary, in our XVI*th.* Article: *After we have received the Holy Ghoſt, we may depart from Grace given* (and *Faith* is a Grace and Gift of God) *and fall into ſin; and by the Grace of God we may riſe again*, &c. The only queſtion is, *Whether they that once have Saving Faith, may loſe it totally and finally.* In which there are various opinions, not only among us, but among themſelves; ſome ſaying, it may be loſt *totally*, but not *finally*; others, that it may be loſt in both regards. But this is no matter of Faith, but only of Opinion; for which we do not break Communion.

All his Proofs therefore out of Scripture, are perfectly impertinent; for they prove what none of us deny, That *men may loſe their Faith, after they have received it.* As for his *Fathers*, St. *Auſtin* in that very Book which he quotes *, aſſerts the direct contrary to what is here pretended to be his ſenſe, That *there are ſome who cannot finally loſe the Grace of God.* For comparing the Grace which *Adam* had, with that which is now given to the Saints, he ſaith, *To the firſt man* (*who had received a power not to ſin, not to dye, not to deſert the good eſtate in which he was created*) *was given the aid of*

* *De correp. & gratia*, c. 12.

Perseverance; not whereby he was made that he should persevere; but without which, he could not by his Free-will have persevered. But now to the Saints, who are predestinated by God's Grace to the Kingdom of God, there is not only given such an aid of Perseverance, but such an one, that Perseverance it self is given them; not only that without this gift they cannot persevere, but also that by this gift they cannot but persevere. For our Saviour saith to his Apostles, not only, without me ye can do nothing (XV. Joh. 5.) *but withal,* v. 16. *Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain.* I have quoted this at large, that such Writers as I have to deal withal, may blush, if they can, at such shameless Untruths as they father upon St. *Austin.* And let a deeper blush colour this man's cheeks, who quotes the *Council of Trent*, which was but a little above a hundred years ago, among the Ancient Fathers. His next Charge is,

XXIV.

They maintain,

XXIV.

That God by his Will and inevitable Decree, hath ordained from all Eternity, who ſhall be damned, and who ſaved.

Anſwer.

AND who is he that dares maintain the contrary? When our Lord hath ſaid in expreſs terms, XVI. *Mark* 15, 16. *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Goſpel to every creature: He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved; but he that believeth not, ſhall be damned.* This is the eternal purpoſe of God in Chriſt, which the Apoſtles were commanded to publiſh every where, as his inevitable Decree concerning mankind, which cannot be avoided: That if they do not believe the Goſpel which is preached to them, they ſhall periſh; but if they ſincerely believe it, and be baptized, they ſhall be ſaved.

This Babbler, I doubt not, would have ſaid ſomething elſe, but he had not the wit, *viz.* That we maintain, God hath for

his own mere Will and Pleasure, without any respect to mens Faith or Unbelief, resolved to damn some, and to save others. But this is not the Doctrine of our Church, as he might have seen in our XVII*th.* Article. If any among us teach such Doctrine, it is no more than some of their own Doctors have taught. And it is a most senseless thing to accuse us of that, which if it be a fault, they are as chargeable with it themselves.

His Scriptures prove nothing contrary to us; but we expressly teach according to the first of them, 1. *Tim.* II. 3. That *we ought to receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture.* And therefore we must believe, That *God would have all men to be saved*; notwithstanding which, such Triflers as this man is, must be told, that *God will have some men to be damn'd*, (as I show'd before) and these two Propositions do not contradict one the other.

1 Tim. II. 3.

The next is of the same import, 2 *Pet.* III. 9. *God is not willing any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.* And yet he is willing, nay resolved, that all those shall perish, who will not repent.

2 Pet. III. 9.

For want of other Scriptures, he runs to those that are *Apochryphal*, and quotes a passage

passage out of the Book of *Wisdom*; which we believe to be *Canonical* enough in this point: And then he returns to Scripture; a great many Texts of which he jumbles together with some *Apocrypha*; but if any one will take the pains to consult them, he will find they do not contradict any thing that *We* or other *Protestants* affirm. Even they who believe the *absolute and irrespective Decree*, consent to what the Prophet *Hosea* saith, (XIII. 9. which is his first place), *That every man's destruction is of himself.* He beats the air therefore in alledging those places, and the sayings of the Fathers; to which we subscribe, and so do all other *Protestants*; whose true opinion this poor *Ignoramus* did not understand, and therefore could not oppose. For those that say, the cause why some are reprobated, is God's Will and Pleasure, yet maintain the cause of their Damnation and Destruction, is their own sins. This, if he had questioned, and ask'd them, Why God reprobates this man rather than another? they would have had St. *Austin* as ready at hand, as he hath, to answer for them. '*You seek to know* '*the Causes of God's Will, when the Will of* '*God is the very cause of all things that are* For if the Will of God have a Cause, there

'is something which antecedes his Will, 'which it is impious to believe. If any man 'therefore ask, Why God made this? The 'Answer is, Because he would. If he go 'on to ask, Why would he? He searches 'for something greater than God's Will, 'when nothing greater can be found. *Let 'human temerity therefore bridle it self, and not 'seek for that which is not, lest he do not find 'that which is*, L. de Gen. contra Manich. C. 2.

Further they hold (saith he)

XXV.

That every one ought infallibly *to assure himself of his Salvation; and to believe that he is of the number of the Predestinate.*

Answer.

NO man in his wits, much less any Church, ever uttered such foolish words as these; which are inconsistent with the former Assertion, That God hath resolved to damn some men. How can they

who

who ſay this, oblige every man to believe he ſhall be Saved? The moſt that any one hath ſaid is, that (not *every one*, but) *every true believer*; every one that is juſtified, ought to be ſo aſſured. So *Bellarmine* himſelf repreſents their Doctrine, which hath as many friends and favourers in the *Roman* Church, as it hath in ours. Where no more than this is commonly taught, That *being aſſured of the truth of the Divine promiſes (which cannot deceive us) we are ſo far aſſured of attaining them, as we are certain, that we faithfully perform our duty; which is the condition upon which the attaining of them depends.*

But this is a very ſtrange Man; for becauſe *every Man* ought not to be aſſured of his Salvation, he will allow *no Man* to be aſſured; no, not St. *Paul*. Expreſly againſt the Doctrine of his own Church, which looks upon him as a man particularly elected by God, not only to the Apoſtleſhip, but to Salvation. Nor doth he contradict this, in 1 *Cor.* XIX. 27. but rather tells us how he ſecured his Salvation, *by keeping under his Body*. By which means, we alſo may be ſecured; for if we *continue in his Goodneſs*, as the next Scripture ſpeaks, XI. *Rom.* 20, 21. we ought not to doubt he will continue

1 Cor. XIX. 27.

XI. Rom. 20, 21.

nue it unto us to the end. And we teach no other aſſurance of Salvation, but by conſtant Fidelity unto Chriſt; which as long as we maintain, we ought to be certain of the other. The only fear is, leſt we ſhould not be ſtedfaſt; and therefore we are well admoniſhed in the next Scripture, II. *Philip.* 12. to *work out our Salvation with fear and trembling.* But ſo doing, we ſhall undoubtedly be ſaved.

2 Philip. 12.

No Church in the World more beats down *vain ſecurity*, than this of ours; nor doth any more incourage it, than the Church of *Rome*; where men are ſecured of their Salvation, if they can be ſo vain as to believe it, by confeſſing to a Prieſt, and receiving his Abſolution at the laſt Gaſp.

The other Scriptures which he hath ſhovelled together, are of no different import from theſe, and therefore need not be examined. Nor his *Fathers* neither, which they have now made a ſhift to ſcrape together, tho they had none in the firſt Edition of this Book. For they that read *Bellarmine*, could not but know what a great number of Teſtimonies are brought out of the *Fathers*, to confirm their Opinion, who hold men may be ſo certain they are in a ſtate of Grace,

Grace, that they may be aſſured of their Salvation. Particularly out of St. *Auſtin*, in a great number of places; more eſpecially in XXII. *Tract.* upon St. *John*, where he argues thus. Our Saviour hath told me, *He that hears my words, and believes on him that ſent me, hath eternal life, and ſhall not come into condemnation.* 'Now, I have heard the words of my Lord; I have believed; 'when I was an Infidel, I was made a faith-'ful man; and therefore, as he tells me, 'I have paſſed from Death unto Life, and 'ſhall not come into Condemnation; *not by my preſumption, but by his own promiſe.* Which words are ſo convincing, that *Bellarmine* * himſelf acknowledges, every one may conclude from this promiſe of Chriſt, he is paſſed from Death unto Life, *&c. The only queſtion is, with what certainty this can be gathered, which St.* Auſtin, ſaith he, *doth not explain.* But it is plain to every underſtanding, that there is the ſame certainty of the Concluſion, that there is of the Premiſes. A man may be as certain of his Salvation, as he is, that he ſincerely believes Chriſt's words, and is obedient to them. Nor doth the place, which this man quotes out of St. *Auſtin*, contradict this, but rather confirm it; if the following

* *L. III. de Juſtif. C. X.*

ing words be added, which this man fraudulently conceals. They are these *, *There is no stability, nor hope in my self. My soul is troubled within me: Wilt thou not be troubled? do not remain in thy self; but say, To thee, O Lord, have I lift up my Soul. Hear this more plainly. Do not hope from thy self, but from God. For if thy hope be from thy self, thy Soul will be troubled; because it hath not yet found, whence it may be secure of thy self.* Which shows St. *Austin* thought men might attain to security, but not in or from themselves; but in God alone, before whom every one ought to humble himself, that he may exalt him. It is to no purpose to examine the rest.

In Psalm XLI.

XXVI.

That every Man hath not an Angel-Guardian, or Keeper.

Answer.

MEN may believe, either that every one *hath*, or *hath not*, and yet not contradict our Church, which hath determined nothing about it; nor hath it been resolved

reſolved in any Church, but every one left to think as he pleaſes. For all that *Suarez* and *Vaſquez* (other kind of men than this) durſt ſay in this caſe, is this; that tho this Aſſertion *be not expreſt in Scripture, nor defined by the Church* (mind that) yet it hath been received with ſuch an univerſal conſent, and hath ſuch great foundation in Scripture, as underſtood by the *Fathers*, that it cannot be denied without great raſhneſs, and almoſt Error. See here how cautiouſly theſe Learned men ſpeak, and and how ingenuouſly they confeſs *the Church* hath determined nothing in this Point, but it is a kind of popular opinion. As for Scripture, in direct contradiction to this man, they tell us, it is not expreſly delivered therein: And whatſoever foundations they think are there laid for this Opinion, it ſeems to me, upon ſerious conſideration, that the Scriptures rather ſuppoſe, that every man (no, not the good) *hath not a particular guardian Angel, that conſtantly attends him*: But God ſends either one or more Angels, as there is occaſion, and as he thinks fit, to do what he appoints: Who after they have diſpatch'd that buſineſs, depart from them, till he thinks fit again to employ thoſe, or ſome other

other Heavenly Messengers for their good. This seems very manifest to me, in that which is reported, concerning *Abraham*, *Daniel*, St. *Peter*, St. *John*, and the *Blessed Virgin* her self in the I. of St. *Luke*. Let him, or any one else, show such proofs, if he can, out of Scripture, That the Angels do constantly remain with those whom they sometimes attend, and are fixed in their Office of Guardianship to them.

XVIII. Matth. 10.

XVIII. *Matth.* 10. Speaks not of *One Angel*, but of more: and doth not say, they Guard Christs *little ones*, but that they *alway behold the face of his Father in heaven*; that is, wait to receive his Commands (as Servants who stand before their Master) which they are ready to execute. This confirms the other Opinion, I now mentioned, that Angels are only sent as God Orders, and are not fixed in their Attendance. Neither doth this *Text* speak of *every man*, as this Scribler idly talks; but of *Christians*, and particularly the weaker sort, called *little ones*, who most needed their Ministry. Mr. *Calvin* also in that very place, which this man mentions, restrains his question to *the faithful*; who, he dare not say, have every one of them a particular Angel to minister to them, but rather

rather inclines to the contrary Opinion.

The XCI. *Pſalm* 11, 12. Proves the very ſame, That God gives his Angels charge of *Good men.* But it neither ſpeaks of *one* who is the *Angel-keeper*, nor that the Angels, whether more or fewer, *remain always* with good men. There were a great many about one Prophet *Eliſha*, 1 *Kings* VI. 12. But it is not likely, that thoſe Troops were his conſtant Guard. But it is in vain to appeal to S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* his opinion, that it is meant of the *Angel-keeper*; for they will not in other caſes, as I ſhall ſhow ſhortly, ſtand to his judgment. XCI. Pſal. 11, 12.

It is true, in the XII. *Actis* 13. The *Jewiſh* Chriſtians, who were aſſembled in *Mary*'s Houſe, were of opinion, That it was the *Angel of St. Peter*, who knock'd at the door: But whether this opinion was true, or no, is the queſtion: which the Scripture doth not reſolve: Nor can we gather the Faith of the *Primitive Church* (which this man thinks is apparent from this place) from the opinion of a few of the *Jewiſh Chriſtians*; who had many opinions, which I hope this man will not juſtifie. And though this ſhould prove ſuch a man as *Peter* had an Angel-Guardian, it will not prove that *every man* hath. XII. Acts 13.

For

For this seems to have been the old opinion among the *Jews*, That only excellent men, Persons of great integrity and usefulness, had such attendants to take care of them; for instance, *Jacob*, as one may gather out of St. *Chrysostom*'s *Third Hom.* upon the *Colossians*. But it doth not appear that they thought they had them *always*; nor *one* and the *same*, when God favoured them with their Ministry. And thus Mr. *Calvin* (in that place of his *Institutions*, which this man quotes) says he does not see what should hinder us from understanding this *Angel of St. Peter*, of *any Angel whatsoever*, to whom God committed the care of him at that time, whom we cannot therefore conclude to have been his *perpetual keeper*.

Let who pleases *see more*; he will not find one of the Scriptures he quotes, speak home to the point: No, not those out of *Tobit* (which he knows we do not own for any part of the *Rule of our belief*) for it doth not follow, that *every man* hath an *Angel-Guardian*, if *Tobit* had one who accompanied him in that journey. No, *Tobit* himself had not his company *always*; but the Angel when he had finished his journey, departed from him. See how fooliſh this man is, who not only quotes Books, which

we

we allow not to be *Holy Writ*, but alledges places there, that make againſt him.

And his *Fathers* he quotes as madly, beginning with St. *Gregory*; and putting even *Gregory of Tours* before St. *Auſtin*. And the Reader may judge of what value his Teſtimonies are, by what he alledges out of St. *Hierome*; whoſe words if he would have given us intirely, it would have appeared they carry no Authority with them. For it immediately follows, *Whence we read in the Revelation of St.* John, *to the Angel of* Epheſus, *of* Thyatira, *and the Angel of* Philadelphia: As if theſe had been Guardian Angels of theſe Churches, to whom our Saviour wrote; when all agree, they were the *Biſhops* of thoſe Churches; as *Ribera* confeſſes; who juſtly wonders that St. *Hierome*, or any one elſe, ſhould think them to be *Angelical Spirits*. If St. *Hierome* wrote thoſe Commentaries, it is manifeſt he departed from the opinion of other Fathers, when he ſaith, That *every ſoul hath its Angel aſſigned it, from its Nativity*: For they ſay only, That *every Believer* hath this privilege. There needs no more be ſaid in this matter, which can at moſt be no more than a probable opinion; and therefore it is not contrary to the Faith, to deny, that

every one of us hath an Angel *for his custody and patronage.*

XXVII.

That the holy Angels pray not for us, nor know our thoughts and desires on earth.

Answer.

NOne of us say, That *the holy Angels pray not for us* in general, (no, many *Protestants* grant it) but we have no reason to believe they pray for us in *our particular concerns*; and we are sure they *do not intercede for us by their Merits*, for they have none. We are sure also, that they *know not our thoughts or desires*; unless they be discovered by external effects or signs, or they be revealed to them by God. For the Scripture expressly saith, God only knows the heart, 1 *Kings* VIII. 39. 1 *Cor.* II. 11. And this *Suarez* * himself saith, is a *Catholick Assertion*, That an Angel cannot naturally know or see the act or free consent of any created will, unless by him that

*L. 2. de Angel. c. XXI. n. 3.

that hath such a free affection it be manifested to another. And this he saith is *deside*; and proves it from *Scriptures* and *Fathers*. Now if any one will say, that God doth reveal our internal thoughts and desires to the Angels. he is a very bold man; unless he have a Divine Revelation for it. None of the Scriptures here mention'd, say any such thing.

The first of them, I. *Zach.* 12. only proves, That an Angel prayed (not for a *particular person*, and his *particular necessities*, but) that he would *have mercy upon Jerusalem and the cities of Judah*; that is, upon the whole Nation. This many *Protestants* grant; and therefore he belies them when he saith, *They believe the Angels do not pray for us*. For this very place is alledged by the Apology for the *Augustan* Confession, and by *Chemnitius* in his Commonplaces, as an argument why they grant, *Angels pray for the Church in general*: For this Text proves no more. I. Zac. 12.

The next, (tho out of an Apocryphal Book, XII. *Tob.* 12.) says nothing of the Angels praying for us, but of their *bringing mens prayers before the Holy One*: Which the same *Protestants* also allow; meaning thereby only a *Ministerial Oblation* of mens Tob. XII. 12.

Prayers before God, (as they explain themselves) not a *Propitiatory Oblation*, which is proper only to Jesus Christ.

VIII. Rev. 4. Unto whom the *third* place belongs, VIII. *Rev.* 4. not to an *ordinary Angel*, but to that great *Angel of the Covenant* (whom the Prophet speaks of, III. *Mal.* 1.) out of whose hand the *smoke of the incense came, and ascended up before God.* So St. *Austin*, and *Primasius*; nay, *Viega*, a famous *Jesuit*, affirms, that most Interpreters, by this *Angel* understand *Christ*: And he gives these good reasons for it: Unto whom, but to him alone, doth it belong to offer the *Incense* of the whole Church, that is, their Prayers, in a golden Censer? Who but he could send down part of the Fire with which the golden Censer was filled, (*v.* 5.) upon the earth, and inflame it with the Fire of the Divine Love, and the Flaming Gifts of the Holy-Ghost? *&c.* See the *Folly* of this man, who applies that to Angels, which belongs, in the opinion of most Interpreters, unto Christ alone. And see his *Falseness* also, who would make his Reader believe that *Irenæus* understood this place as he doth; when he speaks not one word of this matter in the place he mentions; but only saith, *There is therefore an Altar in the*

the Heavens; for thither our Prayers and our Oblations are directed, and to the Temple there; as John in the Revelation ſaith; and there was opened the Temple of God, and the Tabernacle; for behold, ſaith he, the Tabernacle of God, in which he will dwell with men. In which words he hath no reſpect to this place, but to XI. *Rev.* 19. and XXI. 3.

Once more, take notice of the wretched performance of this man, who took upon him to prove, That Angels not only pray for us, but *know our thoughts and deſires upon earth*; about which there is not the leaſt touch in any one of theſe places, which are all he quotes at large. And as for thoſe, the Chapters and Verſes of which follow, they only tell us, what Angels knew of the *mind of God*, which they brought in meſſages to men; but nothing of their knowing the *minds of men.* Let the Reader, if he think good, peruſe them, and he will ſee I ſay true. What heart then can one have to look into his *Fathers*, when he deals thus inſincerely with the Holy Scriptures? But to ſhow that nothing elſe can be expected from ſuch men, I will briefly note, That St. *Hilary* expreſly ſpeaks of ſuch a Miniſterial Interceſſion as many *Proteſtants* grant; that is, of their *bringing mens Prayers to God*, as he

speaks. Whose words are a gloss upon the Apostle's, I. Heb. *For they are ministring spirits sent forth for to minister to them who are heirs of salvation* Whereupon follows the words he quotes, *Therefore the nature of God doth not need their intercession, but our infirmity; for they are sent forth for those who shall be heirs of salvation.* What can be plainer, than that he speaks only of a *Ministerial* (for they are sent forth to *Minister*) not of a *Powerful* Intercession?

XXVIII.

That we may not Pray to them.

Answer.

HERE he speaks some Truth again; and a great many of his own Church ingenuously confess, That there is no command in Scripture, nor so much as an example of Praying to them.

The Text they have most in their mouths, who assert we may Pray to them, is this which he *first* quotes, XLVIII. *Gen.* 16. But by this Angel, a great number of the Fathers understand Christ himself,

XLVIII. Gen. 16.

St. *Cyril*

St. *Cyril*, for inſtance, (to whoſe Authority, I told you, they dare not always ſtand) thus expounds it, L. 3. *Theſaur.* C. 1. And ſo doth *Novatianus* in his Book of the Trinity, C. 15. St. *Athanaſius* alſo againſt the *Arians*, Orat. 4. And St. *Chryſoſtome* upon the place (*Hom. 66. in Gen.*) and divers others. Therefore this is *no ſorry ſhift*, (as this ignorant man preſumes to call it) having ſuch very great Patrons to maintain it. And what if St. *Chryſoſtom* in another place, underſtands this of an Angel, which attends (not *every man*, as this Writer pretends, but) *every Believer* (as his words are expreſly, and St. *Baſil's*) it is no more than ſome *Proteſtants* do, even Mr. *Calvin* himſelf is content with this Expoſition in his *Inſtitutions*, (tho in his Commentaries on *Geneſis* he ſaith it is meant of *Chriſt*), but they of the Church of *Rome* gain nothing at all from this conceſſion. For *Jacob's* words are no direct formal *Invocation* or *Compellation* of the Angel, (for he doth not ſay, *O Angel of God, bleſs the Lads*) but only an earneſt deſire that they might have the *Angelical Protection*; for which he prays to God, That he would ſend the Angel to preſerve them, as he had done him.

Tobit himself meant no more in the place which he next alledges, V. *Tob.* 16. That God who dwells in Heaven, would prosper their Journey, by sending his Angel to keep them company. For it is certain, that the *Jews* never prayed to Angels; and it is as certain, that they constantly define Prayer by a direct and express relation to God, and none else. And therefore it is not to be thought, that any good man among them, ever joyned Prayer to God and an Angel together in the same breath; as he makes *Tobit* do in this place. No, this is contrary to the sense of the greatest Divines in his own Church.

XII. *Hosea* 4. Before he ventured to alledge the next place, XII. *Hos.* 4. he should have been sure that the Prophet speaks of a Created Angel, and not of the Son of God, who in the Opinion of *Justin Martyr*, *Eusebius*, St. *Hilary*, and many more Fathers, appeared to *Jacob*, and blessed him. Whence it is that he called the place *Peniel*, having there seen the *face of God*. And to this sense the next verse inclines, where he is called *the Lord God of Hosts*, who found *Jacob* in *Bethel*. Which the Fathers in the Council of *Sirmium* thought so certain, that they denounce a Curse against those that maintain'd

tain'd it was the *unbegotten Father*, *not the Son*, (for God they concluded he was) that wreſtled with *Jacob*. But ſuppoſe it was an Angel, the *Hebrews* are ſo far from thinking that *Jacob* made ſupplication to him, that they conceive (many of them) the Angel made ſupplication to *Jacob*, for he prayed him to *let him go*. Take it otherwiſe; it ſignifies no more but that he deſired him to give him his bleſſing: which we deſire of men here upon Earth, to whom we do not properly pray.

From hence he paſſes to ſatisfy Scruples, which he ſaith ſome have: who ſay, they would pray to them, *if they could be aſſured that they hear us*, &c. Who they are that ſay thus, I know not: they are none of us. For we do not think it lawful to pray to them, though they could hear us. But how doth he prove that they can hear us? Why, he brings the common place, XV. *Luke* 10. which ſaith there is *joy in their preſence*, that is, *in heaven* (as it is, v. 7.) *over one ſinner that repenteth*. Which ſhews they know when there is joy in Heaven, and what that joy is for; becauſe they are in Heaven: but it doth not prove they know *all things that paſs upon earth*; but only thoſe things, of which notice is given in Heaven. At this rate we may

may prove, that good men know all that is done on Earth, because they rejoice at the Conversion of of a Sinner: that is, when they hear of it; and the Angels rejoice no other ways.

They that like his Performances upon these Texts, may look into the rest: and see how, to fill up the number, he alledges the same over again, XII. *Hos.* 4. and now also quotes XIX. *Gen.* 18, *&c.* to prove *we may pray to Angels*, which in the foregoing Section, he brought to prove, that *they pray for us*. Nay, sends us to the *Song of the three Children*; where I can find nothing of praying to the *Angels*, no more than of praying to the *Sun*, and *Moon*, and *Stars*.

His quotation out of St. *Austin's* Annotations on the Book of *Job*, is not worth our regard. For St. *Austin* * himself was doubtful whether he should own them, being put forth by others, rather than him; and so corruptly, that he would scarce say they were his. And being admitted for his, he doth not speak home to this man's purpose: For he only says, *Job* seems to intreat the *Angels*, that they would deprecate for him; or rather the *Saints*, that they would pray for a Penitent. Now this is not the *Religious invocation*, which the *Romanists*

* *See his* Retract. L. 2. C. 13.

manifſts plead for; but only ſuch a deſire as we make to a Friend here on Earth, to help us by his prayers. But whatſoever St. *Auſtin* may be ſuppoſed to ſay, it is manifeſt, he that thus interprets the place, miſtakes very much; fancying thoſe to be *Friends in Heaven*, who are *Friends on Earth*; of whom *Job* moſt certainly ſpeaks. And ſo doth the next place; V. *Job* 1. which ſpeaks not at all of praying to the *Saints*, but of deſiring them to appear for him, and teſtify to his innocence. Thus *Menochius* himſelf expounds it, *The meaning ſeems to be, I* (that is *Eliphaz*) *have already told thee my Opinion, If thou haſt any Patron among the Saints, or whoſe teſtimony thou canſt bring forth in thy defence; do not delay, but produce it before us. They can tell of none* (as others enlarge upon the words) *who was ever oppreſſed with ſuch Calamities as are fallen upon thee, unleſs they deſerved them for their ſins.* If theſe words relate to Angels, as ſome *Proteſtants* think they do (becauſe the LXX. here have *Angels*, inſtead of *Saints*) the meaning is the ſame: *If thou haſt ſeen an Angel, as I have done* (IV. 15.) *he can give thee no other anſwer.* Thus the ſame *Menochius*. V. Job 1.

Pro-

Proteſtants hold, he ſaith,

XXIX.

That the Angels cannot help us.

Anſwer.

THIS man ſeems to have been in love with lying: elſe he could not have invented ſuch a ſenſeleſs falſhood. For no Proteſtant ever was ſo fooliſh as to ſay, *they cannot help us.* We believe they both can, and do: and we thankfully acknowledge their miniſtry, in our Publick Prayers on *Michaelmas* day. But we look upon them *only as Miniſters*; who can do nothing of themſelves, but as they are ordered. For they are not ſet over us as Lords, to act according to their own pleaſure: but ſent by the great Lord of all, to do us ſervice as he appoints them.

Neither his *Scriptures*, nor *Fathers*, ſay more than this, and we ſay the ſame: therefore what a Trifler is this, who blots Paper to prove the Sun ſhines!

XXX.

XXX.

That no Saint deceaſed, hath afterward appeared to any upon Earth.

Anſwer.

THIS is juſt ſuch another Falſhood; deviſed on purpoſe to have ſomething, right or wrong, to object againſt us: For no *Proteſtant* is of this mind. He ſaith, he hath met with *ſome ſuch:* But for my part, I cannot give any credit to one, who hath told ſo many untruths.

The Scriptures therefore which he alledges, need not be conſidered; much leſs his Story out of the *Maccabees*. And his *Fathers* are ſuch as were impoſed on by Fabulous Relations, deviſed to make way for the belief of *Purgatory*. And ſuch *Apparitions* we have great reaſon to doubt of.

XXXI.

That the Saints deceased, know not what passeth upan Earth.

Answer.

NO; not every thing that here passeth, as his words seem to import. For so *Aquinas* * himself resolves, speaking of the knowledge of the Blessed in Heaven, *Though it be the natural desire of a rational Creature to know all things which belong to the perfection of its understanding (which are the species and kinds of things, and the reasons of them, &c.) Yet to know particulars, and the thoughts and actions of them, belong not to the perfection of a created understanding: nor doth its natural desire tend to this.* The very same say we; and a little more: they may know *some particulars*, at *some times*; but not *all*, at *all times*. And let us hear what this vain Talker hath to say to the contrary.

* *Pars I. 2. XII. Art. 8. ad 4.*

XVI. Luk. 29. *First*, He says, out of XVI. *Luke* 29. That *Abraham* knew *there were Moses and the Prophets Books here on earth, which he had never seen when he was alive.* What a Ninny is this! who undertakes to prove they know what

what paſſeth here at preſent (or elſe he doth nothing) by proving they know what is paſs'd and gone long ago: Which they may know, and not underſtand what is done at this inſtant. Beſides, if they know ſome ſuch general things, it doth not prove they know all particulars: For inſtance, what I am now writing about this matter. St *Auſtin*, in that Book he mentions, doth indeed ſay, *Abraham* knew of *Moſes*: But in the very ſame Book, and the Chapter foregoing (*C.* 13.) he expreſly ſaith, the ſpirits of the dead are there, *Where they do not ſee whatſoever things are done, or come to paſs, in the life of men.* And in the ſame place he alledgeth, LXIII. *Iſa.* 16. to prove, That *Abraham and Iſrael did not know what is done in this world, nor how their children fare.* And (to confound this man, and all ſuch falſe pretenders to Learning) he ſaith, in that very Chapter quoted by him (which is the 14*th.* not the 24*th.* for there are not ſo many Chapters in the Book) in expreſs terms, he knew thoſe things, *not while they were a doing when they were alive, but being dead he might know them from* Lazarus; and thus he reſolves, *leſt it ſhould be falſe which the Prophet ſaith, Abraham knows us not.* And then immediately begins the next Chapter,

* *L. de cura pro mortuis.*

Chapter, in this manner, *It must be confess'd therefore, that the dead do not know what is done here, while it is doing; but may hear it afterwards from those, who dying, go from us to them. Not all things indeed, but such as they are suffered to relate, and such as they are suffered to remember, and such as are fit for them to hear. They may hear something also from the Angels*, &c. It would be too long to Transcribe the rest; and this is sufficient to convince those that have a mind to understand the truth, how little credit is to be given to such men as this, Who to give us farther proofs of his folly, alledges, V. *John* 45. to prove the Saints know what's done here. When it's evident our Saviour doth not speak of *Moses* his *Person*, but of his *Writings*, or *Laws*; as he himself could interpret it in the foregoing place.

V. John 45.

XII. *Rev.* 10.

And *who for shame* (to use his own word) but such a man as he, would quote the XII. *Rev.* 10. to prove the *Saints* must know what is done on Earth, because the *Devil* doth; whose business it is *to go to and fro* (which the *Saints* do not) while he seeks whom he may devour: And to prove likewise the Devil knows what's done, because he lays false accusations to the charge of good Christians. So this Text signifies,

fies, as *Menochius* himself expounds it; *The accuser*, saith he, is the *backbiter*, *the calumniator*, *the detractor*, *who accuses the Saints with false criminations, and calumnies, as anciently he did Job.* A most excellent argument to prove the Devil knows what is done here, because he is a lyar, a false accuser, who tells what was never done. Will people never open their eyes, and see the senselessness of these men, who trouble the World with their Brain-sick Discourses?

He promised *express* Scriptures, and perpetually falls into pitiful arguing. As he doth here upon another Scripture in the Old Testament, 2 *King.* VI 12, where, because *Elisha* is said to *know what the King of Israel said in his Bed-chamber*, he concludes that he knew by the light of Prophecy, *even the inward thoughts.* And what if God had revealed this to him (which he did not) would it follow that he knew the words and the thoughts of all *Israel?* And because he knew what the King said in secret, at some time, that he knew what he and all his People said at all times? These are extravagant Conceits; fit only for men in *Bedlam.* What *the light of glory*, as he calls it, can make the Souls of the Blessed un-

2 Kings VI. 12.

derstand, we cannot tell: but they are not capable to understand all particulars, as you heard before. And therefore St. *Au-*
* *Cura pro Mortuis*, c. 14. *stin* *, in the Book and Chapter before-quoted by himself, argues quite otherwise: that it doth not follow, because the rich man told *Abraham* how many Brethren he had, therefore he knew what his Brethren did, and what they suffered at that time. In like manner, he would have argued, no doubt, in any other case, if there had been occasion; that because the *Saints*, for instance, know some things which they are told by others from this World, we must not infer that they know other things besides them.

That which follows is like this, but much worse. For because *Elisha*, 2 *Kings* 2 Kings V. 26. *being afar off*, as he says, saw all that V. 26. passed between *Naaman* and *Gehasi*, therefore the *Saints*, he concludes, see what passes in this World. What mad stuff is this? *Elisha* was not *afar off*, for the Text saith expressly, *v.* 19. *Naaman* was departed from him *a little way*, when *Gehasi* ran after him. And in the very same Book we find, that though *Elisha* knew this thing, at some distance from him, yet he did not know another, which was as easie to know, *viz.*

That

That the *Shunamite*'s Son was dead, 2 *King.* IV. 27.

And how doth St. *Paul*'s being wrapt into the Third Heaven (which is his next proof) give us any reaſon to believe that they who are there know what is done upon Earth? Theſe things hang together, like *Harp* and *Harrow.*

Nor doth it appear that St. *Stephen* ſaw from Earth, as far as Heaven. Our Saviour indeed preſented himſelf unto him, *ſtanding* (not *ſitting*, as this man quotes it) at the right hand of the Divine Glory; which then alſo appeared. But ſo it had done, in ancient times, in the very *door of the Tabernacle*; where the Congregation of *Iſrael* ſaw it without looking as far as Heaven. But if we take it otherwiſe; it doth not follow, that becauſe God can make his Divine Glory ſhine from Heaven to Earth, therefore any one can ſee from Earth to Heaven, or from Heaven to Earth. Much leſs, that the *Saints* can always ſee what is done here on Earth: For St. *Stephen* could not alway behold the glory of God, and our Lord ſtanding at his right hand; but only at that time, upon an extraordinary occaſion, when God in an extraordinary manner ſhone upon him. VII. Acts 55.

All his own Divines will tell him, that *Arguments are not to be drawn from Parables:* such as that of the Rich man and *Lazarus*, (to which he makes his next resort). For if we allow that way of reasoning, then he may prove from hence, that we and the *Saints* may talk together, though at this distance one from another; as the Rich man did with *Abraham*, and *Abraham* with him. Of all the ways that have been invented, to shew how the Saints may know what we do; there was never any so extravagant as this, of their *seeing from Heaven what is done here.*

I believe the Reader is weary of such Discourse as this; especially if he lookt for expres Scripture; which this man bad him expect. Therefore I shall not exercise his patience, with any further notice of what he saith, about *the Communion of Saints*, which may be without the least knowledge they have of us, or we of them: as appears by the Communion of all the Members of Christ's Body here on Earth; some of which never heard of, or have ever seen the other.

Look never so long in the other *Scriptures* he quotes, you will find nothing in them to the purpose. And the *first* of his *Fathers*

Fathers is a Counterfeit; the *two next* we ſhall meet withal preſently, to prove *we may pray to the Saints*; which is the drift alſo of this Diſcourſe.

XXXII.

That the Saints pray not for us.

Anſwer.

THere is no ſuch aſſertion as this among us; but he again calumniates us. For though the Saints cannot know our particular wants, and therefore cannot make *particular* Prayers for us; yet that in *general* they pray for that part of God's Church, which is here on Earth, and perhaps (for this we cannot affirm certainly) for ſome particular perſons, who were well known, and dear to them, when on Earth, we do not deny: But if we did, he is ſo ill provided of Proofs, and of Scripture for it, that thoſe which he alledges will work no belief in us.

For in V. *Rev.* 8. there is a plain repreſentation of the Church here on Earth, not in Heaven. So the latter end of their Song, V. Rev. 8

v. 10. might have informed him, where they say, *Thou hast made us unto our God Kings and Priests, and we shall reign on the Earth.* And thus many of the Fathers understood it; as he might have learnt from *Viega*, one of their own Doctors. So that he might have spared his *lo, how*, &c. and we may rather say, in imitation of it, *Lo, how silly an Interpreter* this is of such *Divine Mysteries*!

2 Macc. XV. 14. What is recorded in a Book of no authority, 2 *Maccab* XV. 14. concerning *Judas* his Dreams, is not worth considering: and it proves no more if we should allow it, but only a general recommendation of that Nation to God.

XV. Jer. 1. The next place out of XV. *Jer.* 1. doth not imply that *Moses* and *Samuel* then prayed for them in Heaven, but that if they did, or rather if two such powerful persons were then alive to intercede for that People, they should not prevail. And so St. *Hierom* (whom this man belies, as he doth us) plainly enough expounds it. Nay, his own *Sixtus Senensis* saith, upon the like place (though *Noah*, *Daniel* and *Job* stood before me) that the Prophet speaks upon a supposition, that if such men as they were in this sinful World, they should deliver none, *&c.*

God

God would not hear them, for such a wicked People.

It is of no consequence, what *Baruch* saith, being never reputed a *Canonical* Book, and, according to his own Rule in his Preface, ought to pass for nothing; unless he had prov'd the same that *Baruch* saith, by places of *Canonical* Writ. Besides, *dead Israelites* may mean no more but those now dead, who when they were alive, prayed as their Posterity now did. And so *Nich. Lyra* understands by *dead Israelies*, the holy *Patriarchs and Prophets, who when they were alive, prayed for the good Estate of their Posterity.* Or *dead*, may signify those, whose condition was so low, *that they could do nothing for themselves*, as he describes all *Israel*, v. 10. that *they were accounted with them that go down into the grave*, that is, *dead men.* This, I will stand to it, is an Interpretation they cannot confute. *Theodoret* doth say, that these words *clearly prove the immortality of the Soul:* and that's all. III. Baruc 4.

I see no reason why II. *Rev.* 26, 27. may not be interpreted of the preferment Christ promised, in this world, to those who should *keep his words, i.e.* fulfil his Commands, *to the end* of that present persecution. But, if it relate to the other World, *Menochius*

(a better Interpreter than he) expresly saith, *that Christ speaks of the power which the Saints shall exercise in the day of judgment over all Nations, which did not obey Christ: judging them with Christ, and delivering them to the punishment of eternal death.* Agreeable to what we read III. *Wisd.* 8. *They shall judge the Nations, and have dominion over the people.* St. *Austin* hath not a word of this matter upon the *second* Psalm, but only says, these words, ruling with *a Rod of iron*, is as much, as *with inflexible Justice.* We see what these men would bring things to, if they be let alone. The *Saints* may be looked upon now as Rulers of this World, by a power imparted unto them from Christ, who hath *thus established them*, this man saith, *over the Nations.* He should have shewn us where he reads this, for we cannot find it here.

But this leads him into reasoning again (finding so little help in his expres Scriptures) and that is as weak as all the rest. For it is out of a *Parabolical* Scripture before-named; from which all acknowledge Arguments ought not to be drawn. And besides, it is not a Prayer to *Abraham*, but such a requeſt as we make one to another here, when we want relief.

What

What St. *Auſtin* ſaith on this place, is not worth the ſearching after; for it will prove no more than what he quotes out of his XV*th.* Sermon (*de verb. Apoſtol.*) he ſhould have ſaid the XVII*th.* where he diſtinguiſheth between the Commemoration that was made of the *Martyrs* at the Altar, and of other *Faithful* perſons. For the latter they prayed; but this would have been an injury, he thinks, to the *Martyrs*, by whoſe Prayers we rather ſhould be recommended to God. But this ſignifies no more than a general recommendation of the Church to God's Mercy. His next Father, St. *Hilary*, ſpeaks only of what *Angels* do, not of *Saints:* And I gave an account of that before, but for want of company he brings him in again. He concludes with *Damaſcen*, a Father that lived almoſt Eight hundred years after Chriſt; and was ſo credulous as to vouch it for a Truth, That *Trajan's Soul was delivered out of Hell by* Gregory's *Prayers*; and ſaith, *The whole world witneſſeth it.* Which all the world now, even their own Church, believes to be a fable. And yet this *Damaſcen* ſaith no more, but that they are to be honoured as thoſe that make Interceſſion to God for us; that is, *for the Church.*

XXXIII.

XXXIII.

That we ought not to beseech God to grant our Prayers, in favour of the Saints, or their merits: nor do we receive any benefit thereby.

Answer.

IT is no small favour, that we can get so much truth out of him, as to confess, That *this is one way of their Praying by the Mediation of Saints, to beseech God to grant their desires in favour of them and their merits.* For some of his brethren mince the matter, and say, they only desire the Saints to pray for them. But their *Missals* and *Breviaries* confute such men, as notorious dissemblers; for there are abundance of Prayers like this, That * *by the Merits and Prayers of St.* Nicholas, *God would deliver them from the fire of Hell.* Which if it be an allowable way of Praying, I do not see but the Saints are Mediators of *Redemption*, as well as of *Intercession*, (as they are wont to distinguish) for *by their merits* is a great deal more, than by their *Intercession.* And if they intercede by their merits, wherein do

*Decemb. VI.

do they fall short of Christ? who by his Merits redeemed us, and in virture of the same Merits intercedes for us.

But let us hear his Scriptures; which the Reader may take notice are every one of them out of the *Old Testament*, during which (according to the common Doctrine of their Church) the Souls of pious men were held in a *Limbus*, remote from God, in the borders of Hell; and therefore could not be Interceſſors with God; much less plead their merits. This is enough to overthrow his whole Discourse in this Chapter: yet to shew his folly a little more fully, I am content to consider them particularly.

The first is XXXII. *Exod.* 13. which he hath the confidence to say, is against us in expres words; when there is no mention of merit, and the sense is evidently declared in the Text it self; which speaks of *the Oath of God* to those great men, *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*: shewing that *Moses* his Prayer was grounded not upon their merit, but upon God's gracious Covenant with them, confirmed by his Oath, XXVI. *Gen.* 3. Which is the sense of *Theodoret* also (whom this man most shamefully belies) in the place by him quoted: *Moses* XXXII. Exod. 13.

mentions

mentions the name of the Patriarchs, instead of supplication: and remembers the Oaths made to them, and begs that the Covenants wherein he was engaged to them, might stand firm. Who would trust such a man as this, who makes *Theodoret* say that *Moses added the intercession of the holy Patriarchs, thinking himself insufficient?* when he only saith, *he mentioned their name* (as men *i. e.* in covenant with God) *instead of supplication.* And thus he deals with St. *Austin*, or rather worse; who, in the place he mentions, saith not a word of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, but only of *Moses*, whose merits were so great with God, as his most faithful Servant, that God saith, *Let me alone*, &c. upon which Passage he makes this reflection, *We are admonished* hereby, that *when our merits have so loaded us, as to make us not beloved of God, we may be relieved by the merits of those whom God doth love. For when he saith, Let me alone that I may destroy them; what is it but to say, I would have destroyed them, had they not been beloved of thee?* Now what is this to the meritorious intercession of the Saints in the other World, when he speaks of the *merits* (as his phrase is) of *Moses* here on Earth?

I have

I have been the longer in this, becauſe it will ſerve to anſwer all the reſt. For in 2 *Chron.* VI. 16. the Prayer expreſly relies upon the promiſe *God* had made to his Servant *David*, not upon *David*'s merits. 2 Chron. VI. 16.

In the next place, CXXXII. *Pſal.* 1. God is deſired to *remember David's afflictions*; but how doth it appear that they merited? If this *Pſalm* was made by *David*, (as many think from the firſt 8 Verſes of it) ſure he was not ſo immodeſt as to plead his own merits with God. The truth is, the Penner of this Pſalm, whoever he was, moſt likely *Solomon*, puts God in mind of *David*, and his fidelity to him under all his ſufferings; becauſe of the Covenant God had made, and confirmed by an Oath, with that pious man, *v.* 10, 11, 12. CXXXII. Pſal. 1.

He doth wiſely only to name the next place, 2 *Chron.* I. 9. for the words are expreſly againſt him, which are theſe, *Now, O Lord God, let thy promiſe unto David my Father be eſtabliſhed.* But the alledging LXIII. *Iſa.* 17. argues groſs Ignorance, for it's a plain deſire God would return to them, *for the ſake of the Twelve Tribes of Iſrael, which contain'd his people, who were his inheritance*, as *Menochius*, and indeed the Text it ſelf, expounds it. And this deſire is found-

ed

ed upon the above-named *Covenant*, *Promise*, or *Oath*, made to their Fathers: which he may find in a number of Places, 1 *King.* VIII. 25, 26. 2 *Chron.* XXI. 7. LXXXIX. *Psal.* 3, 4.

Why he adds the two next places, unless to make a show, I cannot imagine. For *Hester*'s Apocryphal Prayer hath nothing in it sounding this way, but only those words, *O God of* Abraham. And *David* only says, 1 *Chron.* XXIX. 8. *O God of Abraham Isaac, and Israel, our Fathers.* Which no Man in the World but himself, I believe, will take to be *naming them for his Intercessors*, (as he speaks) when they evidently signify the favour and kindness God had to them, which he hoped he would graciously continue, according to his Promise, unto his People *Israel.*

The last place, XX. *Exod.* 5. is a direct Confutation of all that he saith; for it mentions not the *Merits* of good Men, but the *Mercy* which God will show unto *thousands* of them that love him, and keep his Commandments.

God of his infinite Mercy, put an end to the reign of these Men, who thus fouly abuse his holy word; that they may no longer pervert the right way of the Lord, and

and miſlead his People into pernicious Errors.

XXXIV.

That we ought not expreſly to pray them to pray or intercede to God for us.

Anſwer.

HEretofore the words were theſe, *That we may not pray to them*; which is the true point. But now they are changed into, *We may not pray them to pray for us.* As if the Church of *Rome* did no more than this; when it is manifeſt they pray directly to them; and *Invocation*, according to their Doctrine, is a part of that *Worſhip* which is due to them; whereas praying them to pray for us (as one man deſires another to do) hath nothing of worſhip in it. He could not go on to deal ſincerely, as he had begun in the former Section. Truth is a very great ſtranger to them; and their great buſineſs is to miſrepreſent both our Opinion and their own.

The

Luk. XVI. 24. The very first Scripture also, which he quotes over again, if it prove any thing, proves more than he would have us think is their Opinion. For the Man doth not say, *I pray Father* Abraham *pray for me.* but *have mercy on me.* But I have told him before, this is a Parable, which he will by no means allow, and thinks to choke us with the *Voice of ten Renowned and Ancient Fathers*, who all affirm this to be a *true History, and not a Parable.* But this Man hath very ill luck with his Fathers; for the very first he mentions (who should have been one of the last) *Theophylact*, not only calls it a *Parable*, but is so confident of it, that he says they *think foolishly* (so it is in the *Greek*, tho in the *Latin* they leave out that word, ἀνοήτως, *foolishly*) who take it for an *History.* The Reader, I believe, blushes for this Man, who if he could or would have look'd into *Maldonate*, (a Jesuit of no mean note) he might have found several other Fathers, whom *Theophylact* follows in this opinion. And St. *Chrysostome* among the rest, who indeed sometimes says it is a *History*; but doth not say, as this Man makes him, that it is *not a Parable.* And if the Cause must be carried by the Voices of Fathers, I can name him more than *Ten*,

or

or a *Dozen*, who say the Souls of the Faithful do not enjoy the Glorious Vision of God till the Resurrection. And therefore *Saints* can neither know our Prayers, nor are to be invoked, as he concludes merely from this Parable. Concerning which, I think both *Maldonate* and *Menochius* (two considerable Jesuits) have very judiciously resolved, for the quieting of this doubt, whether it be *History* or *Parable*; that *it is both*. 'For that there was a rich man, and 'a poor, called *Lazarus*; that the one 'when he died went to Hell, and the other 'was carried to *Abraham*'s Bosome, *is a* '*History*. But that the rich man talk'd with '*Abraham*, and desired him to send *Laza-*'*rus* to cool his Tongue with a drop of 'Water, *is a Parable* adjoyned to the Histo-'ry; for they that are in Hell, do not ask 'Courtesies of the Saints. Now it happens unfortunately for this man, that what he grounds his Argument upon, falls within that part which is *Parable*, *Father* Abraham, *have mercy on me*. Which *Maldonate* judiciously observes, is a form of Speech, which Beggers use, as they lye in the High-way, showing their sores; and well represents how *Lazarus* and he had changed Conditions. *Lazarus* was poor here, and the rich

man stript of all there. Here the rich man enjoyed his pleasure, and there *Lazarus* rejoyced. No man of sense can reject this Interpretation. And yet this Writer cries out, *Lo, two Saints are here prayed to, and besought in one verse.* Nay, he hath the Confidence to ask us, *For God-sake, where are your Eyes?* Truly, mine are newly open this morning, when men are wont to be most sober; and I can see none to whom the rich man addresses his Request, but *Abraham* alone. How this man came to see double, I leave it to himself to consider. Here is not a word said to *Lazarus* in this Parable, but all to *Abraham*; who is desired to send *Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger*, &c. And yet this man was so intoxicated with some thing or other, that he thinks the rich man called upon *Lazarus* also, to have Mercy on him. For shame, let them throw this Book away, and not give it about any more. For all that can be gathered from this story is, that such was the torment of the rich man, that if he could have seen *Abraham*, and *Lazarus* in his Bosom, and have spoken to him, he would have expressed in some such words as these, his intollerable pain.

It

It is to no end to look what St. *Austin* saith I know not where, when he declares himself so positively*, *That tho they named the Martyrs at the Altar, yet they were not invoked by the Priest that sacrificed.*

* L. XXII. *de Civ. Dei* c. 10.

The next place of Scripture, I have considered before, V. *Job* 1. and both given the meaning, and answered his Cavils, when he brought it to prove *praying to Angels*, as now (so indigent and beggarly they are) it is pressed for *praying to Saints*.

He will lose his labour, that looks into the other places, which he barely names; or into his Fathers. Some of which are forged, as *Dionysius Areop. Athanasius de Annunc.* St. *Chrysostom*, Hom. 66. *ad Pop.* (for there's but one and twenty in the Ancient Greek MS. as *Posevine* acknowledges) *Maximus Taurin.* whose Sermon upon Saint *Agnes* is by others ascribed to St. *Ambrose*; but *Bellarmin* confesses it contradicts St. *Ambrose* in another place, and therefore cannot be his, nor any one's else on whom we can rely. And others of his *Fathers* are falsely alledged, as St. *Basil*, who only says, that People *run to their Memories*, or Monuments; *viz.* there to pray to God, not to them. St. *Bernard* is a Father that lived a-

bove 1150. years after Chriſt, who ſhould have learnt of his Elders; particularly *Epiphanius* *, that *Mary is to be honoured, but God the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt alone to be worſhipped.* I could name a vaſt number of the Fathers, who expreſly condemn this Worſhip of Saints; and none more than Saint *Chryſoſtom.* St. *Hierom* doth not pray to *Paula*, but ſpeaking to her in an Oration, as if ſhe were preſent, ſaith, *Farewel* Paula, *and help thy honourer* (that is, him that honoured her when ſhe was alive) *with thy Prayers.* From hence one may plainly conclude, he never intended to pray to her, for he takes his leave of her, and bids her *adieu*; and is one of thoſe Fathers, who believed the Saints do not know what we do here; as appears by another Epitaph he made upon *Nepotian*, as this upon *Paula*; where he ſaith, *Nepotian* was happy in that *he neither ſaw, nor heard* the Calamities which were then upon the Church.

* *Her.* LXXXIX.

XXXV.

XXXV.

That the Bones or Relicks of Saints, are not to be kept, or reſerved; no vertue proceeding from them, after they be once dead.

Anſwer.

HEre he ſaith ſome truth. We do believe they ought not to be *kept* or *reſerved* (that is, *to be worſhipped*) but to be decently buried: as we read, in the moſt ancient Letter of the Church of *Smyrna*, the Reliques of *Polycarp* were.

His firſt Text, 2 *King.* XIII. 21. ſaith not a word (much leſs ſpeaks *expreſly*) of their taking the Bones of *Eliſha* out of the Sepulchre; but, for any thing that appears, they let them lie there ſtill. Nor doth it ſay, any vertue proceeded out of them, but that, upon the touching of them, the dead man revived and ſtood upon his feet; that is, *was raiſed by the power of God.* Who thereby teſtified to the truth of *Eliſha*'s Prophecy; and confirmed the *Iſraelites* in the belief of what he had ſaid a little before he died, concerning their Victories over the *Syrians.* 2 *King.* XIII. 21.

Acts V. 14, 15. The next place V. *Act.* 14, 15. is alledged so senseleſly, that it may tempt one to be a little pleasant upon it. For is not *a shadow* cast from a man's Body a pretty Relick? Who caught it? How did they keep it? Who can shew us this Relique? or where shall we find it reserved? And what proof is there that vertue proceeded out of *Peter's shadow*, and cured sick People? we believe it went forth from our Lord, as *Peter* passed by, and cast his shadow upon them. The Sermon he quotes of Saint *Austin*, is a Bastard, lewdly fathered on him. And the gloss which this man makes upon this passage of it, is very idle. For it is most reasonable to take the sense of it to be this, that *if they received so much benefit by his shadow, the fulness of his power could do more for them*; speaking, not of what he can do now in Heaven, but what at that time they might have received, when his very shadow coming upon them, *they were healed of their Infirmities.* So he says, the words are in their Bible; but he undertook to confute us out of our own. And if this passage was in ours (as it would have been now, if it had been found in the most ancient Copies) it would have signified no more, then the rest of the words do without

out it. Which give us ſufficiently to underſtand, that the ſick were cured when *Peter*'s ſhadow overſhadowed them.

XIX. *Acts* II. 12. ſays not a ſyllable of thoſe *Aprons* and *Handcherchiefs* being *kept as Relicks:* much leſs of their working any Cures when the Apoſtles were dead, or after that time when they were immediately brought from St. *Paul*'s Body unto the Sick. St. *Chryſoſtom* might well argue the Divinity of our Saviour, from the power that wrought in his Servants, nay accompanied their very *Shadows and Napkins.* But doth this prove, that theſe *Napkins* were kept as Reliques (Shadows we are ſure could not) and that this vertue proceeded from them, was inherent and continued in them when the Apoſtles were gone? For this, the Reader may go look, if he know where.

Hitherto we have not heard one word to the purpoſe; and if we will *ſee more*, we ſhall find nothing but that they carried *Joſeph*'s Bones with them when they went out of *Egypt* (XIII. *Exod.* 19.) becauſe he charged them ſo to do: as an argument God would bring them into *Canaan*; where he deſired his Bones might be laid in the Grave of his Father; not kept as Relicks XIII. Exod 19.

for People to kiss and worship. We read also that *Elijah*'s Mantle fell down from him, when he was carried to Heaven; with which *Elisha* smote the waters, 2 *Kings* II. 8. 14. but what became of this Mantle, we do not read; it is most likely he wore it out. I can find nothing of the *reverend esteem* St. *John Baptist* had of our Saviour's *Shoe-latchet*; much less of his keeping it for a Relick; I. *John* 27. He only expresses his reverent esteem of our Saviour, whom he was not worthy to serve in the meanest Ministry; as the Woman did her high opinion of him, when she stooped to touch the hem of his Garment.

2 King. II. 8. 14.

I. Joh. 27.

His *Fathers* help him not at all. For *Eusebius* only saith, the Chair of St. *James*, first Bishop of *Jerusalem*, was preserved: but not a word of its having any vertue in it; or of its being kept to be worshipped, as they now do Relicks. *Athanasius* * speaks of an old Cloak, and another Garment which St. *Anthony* desired might be given to him (who had bestow'd it on him new) when he died; as we are wont to bequeath something or other in remembrance of us: But that he laid it up, and delivered it to posterity as a sacred

* *In Vita S.* Anton.

ſacred Relick, we are yet to learn. And how far he was from deſiring to have his Garments preſerved as Relicks, appears from the Charge he gives, in the ſame place about his own Body, which he would not have them carry into *Egypt*, *leſt it ſhould be reſerved in ſome of their Houſes* * (mind this) but bury it in ſome unknown place. And ſo they did, none knowing where they interred it, but only two Servants to whom that care was committed. His Friends indeed, he ſaith, kept thoſe Garments, as *ſome great thing:* but mark what follows as the Reaſon, *For he that ſaw them, thought he ſaw* Anthony; *and he that wore them, was as if he carried about with him joyfully his Precepts.* They were not laid up then as Relicks, but uſed ſtill as Garments, which put them in mind of him, and of his words. St. *Baſil* doth ſpeak of wonderful things at the touch of the Bones of a Martyr, whom God was pleaſed to honour at that time, to convince Unbelievers of the truth of that Religion, which *Martyrs* ſealed with their Blood. But there is no reaſon to expect ſuch things now; nor have their *Bones* been preſerved to this Age. Saint *Chry-*

* Μήπως ἐν τοῖς ὅτι κοις ἀπόθωνται.

Chryſoſtom's words are falſly alledged by *Bellarmin* (from whom this man hath all theſe Fathers) when he makes him ſay, *Let us viſit them often, let us adore their Tombs*; when in truth the very *Latin* Interpreter hath it, *let us adorn their Tombs*: and this not according to the *Greek*, where it is, *let us touch their Coffin.* St. *Ambroſe* his honouring the Aſhes of Martyrs, is nothing to the worſhipping of them. If we knew of any true Relicks of their Bodies, we ſhould not fail to honour them: And we think the greateſt honour would be, to give them a decent burial.

XXXVI.

That creatures cannot be ſanctified, or made more holy than they are already of their own nature.

Anſwer.

NO; not ſo much as to make them become *Sacramental* things, which have a power in them to purge away venial ſins, cure

cure diſeaſes, drive away devils, preſerve from all dangers, and produce other ſuch-like ſupernatural effects; which they aſcribe to *Holy Water*, and many other bleſſed things. But that creatures may be ſet apart to holy uſes, we own by our practice; and withal acknowledg, That by Prayer and Thankſgiving to God, they may be bleſſed to us in the uſe of them, more than otherwiſe they would be. It is only the forementioned Sanctification of them, which we believe to be ſuperſtitious and magical; for we can find nothing in God's Word, to warrant ſuch conſecrations of creatures to thoſe ſupernatural effects.

St. *Paul* in 1 *Tim.* IV. 4. ſpeaks only of a general ſanctification of the things we eat and drink; which may be performed by any good Chriſtian; not of ſuch a *ſpecial* one as this man intends, made by the Biſhop: For doth any creature that we receive (tho *ſanctified by the Word of God and Prayer*) cure diſeaſes, lay ſtorms and tempeſts, preſerve from Thunder and Lightning, and ſuch-like miſchiefs? The Apoſtle plainly diſputes againſt thoſe who condemned the uſe of certain meats (as not only the *Jews*, but the Followers of *Si-*

1 Tim. IV. 4.

mon

mon Magus, *Ebion*, and others did) which he proves from the words of *Moses*, as *Theodoret* observes, are all good in their kind. And if they be *received with Thanksgiving*, *in remembrance of God* (who hath made these things, and *by his Word* given us allowance to eat them) they become more than good, saith the same *Theodoret* ; being sanctified by that holy action, which makes the use of them well-pleasing to God. That's the most that can be meant by *Sanctified* : And so *Emanuel Sa*, one of his own Interpreters expounds it. *It is sanctified*, that is, *made fit for food* Which *Claud. Guillandus*, like a man of learning, thus further explains ; *It is sanctified by the* 'word of God, ' by which we believe that 'nothing is any longer common or un-'clean ; and *by Prayer*, whereby we request 'that such things may be given us, and for 'which, being given, we return thanks to 'God. But the *Popish Sanctification* of Creatures, supposes, that they are not only unclean, but that the Devil is in them, or that they are under his power (the very opinion of the *old Hereticks*), which is the reason of their *Exorcisms*, that they may cast the Devil out of them. Whereas, should we grant they are any way unclean

clean (as *Theophylact* and *Menochius* think the Apoſtle ſpeaks by way of *Conceſſion*) it is quite taken away and purged (that's all they underſtand by *Sanctification*, if we take this to be the ſenſe) *by God's word*, which allows the uſe of them; and by *Prayer* and *Benediction*, when we ſit down to eat our meat.

We need not be told, That in ancient time they ſent ſometimes part of the Conſecrated Bread unto their neighbours, in token of mutual love and fellowſhip in the ſame Faith: But this was forbidden by the Council of *Laodicea*; and when afterwards they ſent only Bread *Bleſſed*, not Conſecrated, unto thoſe who were not yet baptized, but in the number of Learners under inſtruction; that had the like meaning, to put them in hope they ſhould at laſt be taken into Church Communion. But what is this to the Bleſſing of *Water*, and *Oyl*, and *Wax*, &c. for ſuch purpoſes as *Agnus Dei's* are Conſecrated in the *Roman* Church? Which may be ſeen in ſeveral of our Authors out of the *Ceremoniale*.

His Texts out of XXIII. *Matth.* 17, 19. prove *no ſuch Sanctification* either of the *Altar* or *Gift*, but only the ſeparation of them from profane uſes; which doth not amount to

to the making them *powerful against sin, the Devil, and all manner of evil.*

He bids us *see more* in 2 *Kings* II. where we find *Elisha* cast salt in the waters, and thereby made them *wholsome to drink*; but did not infuse into them such a vertue as they pretend to give to the water mixed with salt, which the Priest exorcises in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, with Crosses at the name of every one of them; that it may become an exorcised water, *to drive away all the power of the enemy, and to root out the Enemy himself, with all his apostate Angels*; as their Church speaks in the *Office* for this purpose.

Why he mentions *Raphel*'s using the *Liver of the Fish* to drive away the Devil, and *David*'s *Harp* to keep the evil Spirit from *Saul*, I cannot devise; for I never read, nor he neither, that they were sanctified any way.

None of his *Fathers*, tho half of them are young ones, in comparison, ascribe any *supernatural vertue* to such things; and therefore it is to no purpose to consider what they say of any other kind of Holiness.

XXXVII.

That children may be ſaved by their Parents Faith, without the Sacrament of Baptiſm.

Anſwer.

NOW he falls again to his old trade of downright calumniating our Doctrine. For we teach, That there is no Salvation for Infants, in the ordinary way of the Church, without Baptiſm. Inſomuch, that by an expreſs Canon (LXIX.) every Miniſter is to be ſuſpended for *three months*, who ſuffers any Infant in his Pariſh to dye without Baptiſm, being informed of its weakneſs, and danger of death, and deſired to come and baptize the ſame: And is not to be reſtored, till he acknowledg his fault, and promiſe before his Ordinary, that he will not wittingly incur the like again. But we do not tye God to thoſe means, to the uſe of which he hath tyed us; and therefore do believe, that by his infinite Grace and Mercy, thoſe Infants may be ſaved, who, without their own fault, dye unbaptized. And this was the Faith of the An-

*L.V. *Hist.* c. 22. Ancient Church, as appears from *Socrates* *, who says, *In* Thessaly *they baptized only at* Easter, *by which means many dyed unbaptized*; and by a Decree of Pope *Leo* I. which shows it was an universal custom in other places, to baptize only twice a year; which custom, he saith, hath been changed, because a great many departed without Baptism. But still this is an evidence, they did not think it absolutely necessary; nor do the greatest Doctors of the *Roman* Church, such as *Gabriel Biel*, Card. *Cajetan*, and many others I could name, condemn children to Hell, who dye unbaptized; but being the children of Faithful Parents, look upon them as within the Covenant of Grace, and capable of eternal life: For which they give these reasons: *First*, The infinite Mercy of God, who is not tied to the *Sacraments* which he hath ordained: And *secondly*, The like case under the Old Testament, when *Circumcision* answered to our *Baptism* (as this man acknowledges) and the children dying unbaptized, were notwithstanding saved *by the sole Faith of their Parents*. So S. *Bernard*, *Epist.* 77. *ad Hug. de S. Vict.* and *Cajetan* in 3. *part. Thom.* Q. 68. From whence we may gather, That even this notion of *childrens being saved*

ved by their parents Faith, without Baptiſm, is no more our opinion, than it is theirs. Some ſay ſo among us; and ſo do ſome among them.

Matters therefore being thus ſtated, all his *Texts* are already anſwered. We ſay the very ſame our *Saviour* doth, III. *Joh.* 5. in the very entrance of our *Office of Baptiſm*. Where we make it as a reaſon why the Church ſhould pray, That God will grant to the child, *that thing which by nature he cannot have*, &c. But tho this be the *ordinary* way, we dare not ſay it is the *only*. God's Grace, many of themſelves acknowledge, ſupplies the want of Baptiſm, in extraordinary caſes. Thus even *Lorinus* a Jeſuit, in X. *Act.* 44. and he alledges St. *Auſtin* for it (who was very rigid in this point) that the *inviſible Sanctification* ſometimes is ſufficient, without the *viſible Sacrament*; when not by contempt of Religion, but by mere neceſſity, they are deprived of Baptiſm. And thus *Peter Lombard* * underſtands this Text, *it is to be underſtood of thoſe who can be baptized, and contemn it.*

III. Joh. 5.

* L. IV. Diſtin. 4. c. 2.

III. *Tit.* 5. proves no more, but that Baptiſm is the ordinary way, and ought not to be neglected, where it can be had.

From XVI. *Mark* 16. he concludes peremptorily

XVI. Mark 16. remptorily, That children must be Baptized or not Saved, because they cannot believe; which is to make *Baptism* more necessary than *Belief*: Whereas they cannot be baptized, but upon a supposition of belief, as his own Church acknowledges in the Council of *Trent* *: *Children wanting Faith in the first act, are baptized in the Faith of the Church.* And therefore the true way of arguing from this place is, that as our Lord saith, *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*; so he would have said (had he thought Baptism *absolutely* necessary) *he that believeth not, and is not baptized, shall be damned.* But he only saith, *He that believeth not, shall be damned*; which makes Faith only, *absolutely* necessary. And I showed before, there are those in his own Church, who think the *Faith of the Parents* sufficient for this purpose.

* *Sess.* VII. Can. 14.

1 Cor. VII. 14. And thus the most learned of the *Fathers* expound those words of St. *Paul*, 1 Cor. VII. 14. particularly *Theodoret*: *The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife by the husband*; that is, saith he, *hath hope of Salvation*; *but if either he or she continue in this disease, their seed shall partake of Salvation*: Which is but reason; for if *the unbelieving husband*, suppose, should

ſhould not have ſuffered the child begotten of his *believing wife* to be baptized; who can think this child, ſo dying, periſhed?

His laſt Text, XVII. *Gen.* 14. proves no more but the neceſſity of both *Circumciſion* and *Baptiſm*, where they could be had; as was ſhewn before. For it is evident the children of *Iſrael* were not circumciſed while they were in the Wilderneſs, V. *Joſh.* 5. But who will ſay, that all they who were born, and died within that time, which was forty years, went without remedy to Hell? XVII. Gen. 14.

His *Fathers*, which he hath pickt up out of *Bellarmine*, are not worth examining; becauſe ſome of them ſpeak only againſt thoſe who deny Infants to be regenerate in Baptiſm, as St. *Auſtin*, *Epiſt.* 90. Others ſpeak of it in ſuch terms as are not eaſie to be underſtood; for let him inform us what *Irenæus* means in the place he quotes, That *our bodies have received unity by the waſhing of incorruption, and our ſouls by the ſpirit*: And others ſpeak ſuch words of the neceſſity of Baptiſm, as the Papiſts themſelves will not abide by; but confeſs St. *Auſtin* was too hard in his opinion, which muſt admit of ſome exception: And his opinion is condemned by later Fathers, as they call them; particularly St. *Bernard*, who diſputes a-

gainſt it at large in the Epiſtle before-mentioned. As for St. *Cyprian*'s Epiſtle to *Fidus*, it is wholly againſt the opinion which that Biſhop had received, That children of *two* or *three* days old were not to be baptized; but they were to ſtay till the *eighth* day, as in Circumciſion. But there is not a word of the *abſolute* neceſſity of Baptiſm; but that none ſhould be denied it, tho newly born; who the rather ſhould be received, becauſe, not their own ſins but anothers was there remitted to them.

XXXVIII.

That the Sacrament of Confirmation is not to be uſed.

Anſwer.

HE knew very well, that tho we deny *Confirmation* to be a *Sacrament*, yet we uſe it; not as a *Sacrament*, nor as *abſolutely* neceſſary to Salvation (for we have declared that *children baptized, dying before they commit actual ſin, are undoubtedly ſaved*), but ſo neceſſary unto compleat Communion, that we require the Godfathers and Godmothers to

to bring children baptized, to the Biſhop to be confirmed by him, when they come to years of diſcretion; and we admit none to the Holy Communion of Chriſt's Body and Blood, *till they be confirmed, or be ready and deſirous ſo to be.*

Now where doth the Scripture ſay it is a *Sacrament*? There is not a word of it in VIII. *Acts* 14. much leſs is it there *expreſsly* declared, and declared to be neceſſary, or ſo much as to be uſed by others; but only that the *Apoſtles laid their hands* on thoſe who were baptized, and they received the Holy Ghoſt; which I am ſure no body can now communicate in ſuch Gifts as were then beſtowed. But above all, it is to be noted, that there is nothing ſaid here of the *Chryſm*, or *anointing with holy Oyl*; in which they make this Sacrament conſiſt; but only of *laying on of hands*, unto which they have no regard. For thus Confirmation is performed in the *Roman Church*; the Biſhop takes *ſanctified Chryſm*, as they call it, made of Oyl and Balſom, and therewith anoints a perſon baptized, with the thumb of his right hand, in the form of a Croſs, upon the forehead, which is bound with a fillet on the anointing, till it be dry; and it is alſo accompanied with a box on the ear; all VIII. Acts 14.

which is plainly ordered to be done in their publick *Office* of Confirmation. But nothing of *laying on of Hands* is there mentioned, which they deny to be either the matter, or the form of this Sacrament; tho we read of nothing else but this *laying on of hands*, either here, or in what follows. A clear Demonstration, that this place is *expresly* against their pretended *Sacrament* of *Confirmation*.

VI. *Hebrew* 1. is so far from being contrary to our Doctrine, that some of their own Authors * think it doth not speak of Confirmation at all, but of the *Benediction of Catechumens*, and others; and some of our Authors think it doth, even Mr. *Calvin* himself. But then, it is *expresly* said to consist in *laying on of hands*; and ought not to be turned into a Sacrament; but look'd upon as a solemn *Form of Prayer* (as St. *Austin* calls it) for Youth, who being grown beyond Childhood, made a Profession of their Faith, and thereupon were thus blessed. Which *pure Institution* (as Mr. *Calvin*'s words are) *is to be retained at this day, and the Superstition corrected.* Behold, how vilely the Protestant Doctrine is calumniated by such wretched Writers as this, who seem not to understand Common Sense.

* *Salmero & Justinianus.*

For

For he ſaith, *Confirmation* is here called, not only one of the Principles *of the Doctrine of Chriſt*, but *a Foundation of Repentance*; when all, but ſuch as himſelf, clearly ſee, that the Apoſtle here makes *the Foundation of Repentance from dead Works*, to be one of the *Principles of Chriſt's Doctrine*, as *laying on of hands*, is another.

He betrays alſo notorious ignorance, or falſhood, in the Citations of his *Fathers*, to which he ſends us. For *Tertullian* plainly ſpeaks of the *Unction which accompanied Baptiſm* in his Country; not of a diſtinct Sacrament from Baptiſm. And *Pacianus* alſo mentions it, as a ſolemn Right in the Sacrament of Baptiſm, wherein Children are regenerated. So doth St. *Cyprian* likewiſe, even in that place which he mentions; where is no ſuch ſenſe as he dreams. For he diſputes for the Re-baptizing of Hereticks, *becauſe it is not enough if hands be laid upon them, unleſs they receive the Baptiſm of the Church; for then they are fully ſanctified, and made the Children of God, if they be born by both Sacraments; for it is written, Unleſs a Man be born again of Water, and of the Spirit*, &c. This latter part this Man conceals, which ſhows St. *Cyprian* ſpeaks altogether of *Baptiſm*, in which there were then *Two* Rites,

Washing with Water, and *Laying on of Hands*. Which were not *Two Sacraments* properly, but *Two parts* of the same Sacrament; which he calls *both the Sacraments of Baptism*. Just as *Hulbertus Carnotensis*, calls the Body and Blood of Christ in the Communion, *Two Sacraments*, which in truth are but one. For speaking of three things necessary to Salvation, he saith of the *Third*, that in it *Two Sacraments of Life*, *that is*, *the Lords Body*, *and his Blood*, *are contained*. St. *Hierom* likewise speaks of *Laying on of Hands*, but not as a distinct Sacrament: For he earnestly contends (in that Book) that the Spirit is conferred in Baptism, and that there can be no Baptism of the Church, without the Spirit. I have not taken any notice of St. *Ambrose*, for those Books *of the Sacrament*, which gounder his Name, are none of his.

XXXIX.

That the Bread of the Supper of the Lord, was but a Figure, or Remembrance of the Body of Chriſt received by Faith; and not his true, and very Body.

Anſwer.

THIS is Fiction, and falſe Repreſentation. For we expreſly declare in the XXVIII. Article of our Religion, That it is a *Sacrament of our Redemption by Chriſt's Death, in ſo much that to ſuch as rightly, worthily, and with Faith receive the ſame, the Bread which we break, is a partaking of the Body of Chriſt*, &c. And in our Catechiſm we alſo declare, That the inward and ſpiritual Grace in this Sacrament, is the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. And Mr. *Calvin* himſelf ſaith as much.

But if we had not been of this mind, his firſt place of Scripture, XXII. *Luke* 15. would have proved nothing againſt us; for it ſpeaks only of eating the *Paſſeover*; in which XXII. Luk. 15.

Washing with Water, and *Laying on of Hands*. Which were not *Two Sacraments* properly, but *Two parts* of the same Sacrament; which he calls *both the Sacraments of Baptism*. Just as *Hulbertus Carnotensis*, calls the Body and Blood of Christ in the Communion, *Two Sacraments*, which in truth are but one. For speaking of three things necessary to Salvation, he saith of the *Third*, that in it *Two Sacraments of Life*, *that is*, *the Lords Body*, *and his Blood*, *are contained*. St. *Hierom* likewise speaks of *Laying on of Hands*, but not as a distinct Sacrament: For he earnestly contends (in that Book) that the Spirit is conferred in Baptism, and that there can be no Baptism of the Church, without the Spirit. I have not taken any notice of St. *Ambrose*, for those Books *of the Sacrament*, which gounder his Name, are none of his.

XXXIX.

That the Bread of the Supper of the Lord, was but a Figure, or Remembrance of the Body of Christ received by Faith; and not his true, and very Body.

Answer.

THIS is Fiction, and false Representation. For we expressly declare in the XXVIII. Article of our Religion, That it is a *Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death, in so much that to such as rightly, worthily, and with Faith receive the same, the Bread which we break, is a partaking of the Body of Christ*, &c. And in our Catechism we also declare, That the inward and spiritual Grace in this Sacrament, is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. And Mr. *Calvin* himself saith as much.

But if we had not been of this mind, his first place of Scripture, XXII. *Luke* 15. would have proved nothing against us; for it speaks only of eating the *Passeover*; in which XXII. Luk. 15.

which he instituted this Sacrament; but that followed after: Here he speaks only of the *Paschal Feast*. Insomuch, that *Menochius* thus interprets it, *He most earnestly desired to eat the Paschal Lamb of this year, and this day, in which the Eucharist was to be instituted; and shortly after it was to be shown by his Death, how much he loved Mankind, whom he so redeemed.* It was not therefore the *Pasche* (as this Man speaks) of his true Body and Blood, which our Saviour thus desired to eat. This is an idle fancy of a dreaming Divine, who hath a *Divinity* by himself; which forbids him to admit *Faith to have been in the Son of God.* But St. *Peter* was a better Divine than he, who applies those words of *David* to our Blessed Saviour, *My flesh shall rest in hope, because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell*, &c. II. *Acts* 26,27. Now I would fain know of this Learned Divine, whether there can be any *Hope* without *Faith*, which made him confidently expect to be raised out of his Grave.

XXII. Luke 18. That which follows also in XXII. *Luke* 18. *I will not drink of the fruit of the vine*, &c. plainly belongs to the Paschal Feast, as they stand in St. *Luke*; who immediately thereupon proceeds to the Institution of the *Sacrament*; and speaks of the *Cup* that is there admini-

adminiſtred, as different from the Cup he had before mentioned. If this Man had underſtood his buſineſs, he ſhould rather have alledged XXVI. *Matth.* 29. where immediately after the Inſtitution of the Sacrament, he adds theſe words, *But I ſay unto you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine*, &c. which St. *Luke* puts before the Inſtitution. But it is a wonderful ſtupidity, to conclude from hence, as this Man doth, That Chriſt will drink his own Blood in Heaven, (or elſe he concludes nothing) becauſe there is *no material Bread and Drink* in uſe there. *Menochius* (to name no others) might have taught him better, who thus expounds this paſſage. *Our Saviour ſpeaks after the manner of men, who being to depart from their Friends for a long time, are wont to ſay, We ſhall Eat and Drink together no more. As I ſhall not drink of this fruit of the vine, till that day*, &c. *when I ſhall drink ANOTHER New and Cœleſtial Wine with you, in the Banquet of Eternal Glory.* And he might have known, that we from hence, *with a wonderful force*, (to uſe his own phraſe) conclude, That Wine remains in the Sacrament after Conſecration; becauſe our Saviour calls that which he ſaid before was the *New Teſtament in his Blood*, the fruit of

of the Vine, that is *Wine*. And so not only we, but *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Chrysostom*, *Austin*, *Hierom*, *Epiphanius*, *Bede*, *Euthymius*, and *Theophylact*, refer the *fruit of the Vine* unto the *Blood of Christ*, before mentioned; as *Maldonate* himself acknowledges, and could not produce so much as one *Father* to the contrary.

VI. John 51. He might have known also, that a great many of his own Church, do not think St. *John* VI. 51. and other verses of that Chapter, speaks of *Sacramental Bread*; as for other reasons, so for this; that if he did, then such as *Judas*, who eat the *Sacramental Bread*, must have *Eternal Life*. Which we find our Lord promises, *v.* 40, 47. to those who *believe on him*; and this we take to be the *eating* he here speaks of, as appears by the whole scope of the Chapter. For if any such Conversion, as they fancy in the Sacrament, and call *Transubstantiation*, could be proved out of this Text, it would prove the Flesh of Christ is turned into Bread, rather than the Bread into his Flesh; because he saith, *The Bread that I will give you, is my Flesh*. To make this good literally, it is manifest, *his Flesh must be made Bread*. See into what Absurdities these men draw themselves, by their perverse Interpretations.

ons. It is not worth conſidering what he ſaith about *Beza*'s interpretation of one word in this Verſe; there being thoſe of his own Church, as well as he, that by *living Bread*, underſtand *Bread that gives Life*; which is muſt ſuitable to the words preceding, and unto *v.* 33.

We have noted often enough our Saviours words, both in XXVI. *Matth.* 26. and XXII. *Luke* 19. And therefore do not ſay, as he ſlanders us, That Chriſt gave, and the Apoſtles received, *nothing elſe but bare Bread*; for it was the *Sacrament of Chriſt's Body*; as *Druthmarus*, and a great many more Ancient than he, expound thoſe words, *This is my Body.* We believe alſo, and thankfully acknowledge, that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, *is the Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* But thoſe are St. *Paul*'s words, 1 *Cor.* X. 16. not our *Saviours*; which ſpoils this man's Obſervation, that *our Lord* calls it *his Body*, both before, and at the very giving of it. Which if he had done, (tho theſe, as I ſaid, are St. *Paul*'s words, who only calls it the *Communion of his Body*, &c.) it would prove nothing, but that *the Bread is his Body*, which we believe, and they are ſo abſurd as to deny. Tho we have bidden them note, how

how St. *Paul*, in that very place he next mentions (1 *Cor.* XI.) often calls that, which he ſaith is the *Lord's Body*, by the name of *Bread*, *v.* 26, 27, 28. But they ſhut their Eyes, and will not take any notice of it. Why ſhould we then regard his frivolous Argument (to which he at laſt betakes himſelf) againſt our *true and real receiving of Chriſt by Faith?* Unto which Dr. *Fulk* hath long ago given a ſufficient Anſwer, in his Notes upon this Chapter. We receive him after a Spiritual manner, *By Faith on our behalf, and by the working of the Holy Ghoſt on the behalf of Chriſt.* So there is no need, either of our going up to Heaven, or Chriſt's coming down to us, as he ſillily argues.

His Ancient *Fathers* have been ſo often viewed, and ſhown to be againſt them by our Writers, and that lately (particularly the two firſt he mentions) that I will not go about a needleſs labour, to give an account of them.

XL.

That we ought to receive under both kinds; and that one alone ſufficeth not.

Anſwer.

VEry true: for ſo Chriſt appointed; ſo the Apoſtles both received and gave it; ſo the Church of Chriſt for above 1000 years practiſed; and wo be to them, who alter Chriſt's Inſtitution. Which cannot be juſtified by ſuch fallacious Arguments as this man here uſes, inſtead of giving us expreſs Scripture for it. That he promiſed, but alas! could find none; and therefore makes little trifling reaſonings his refuge.

Firſt from VI. *John* 51. which I have ſhewn doth not ſpeak of *Sacramental eating:* but if it did, the next Verſe but one, he could not but ſee, told him, that *it is as neceſſary to drink Chriſt's blood, as to eat his fleſh.* To which the Anſwer is not ſo eaſy as he fancies: for we have only Dr. *Kelliſon*'s word for it, that the conjunction *and* is uſed for *or.* Men may put off any thing by VI. John 51, 53.

by such shifts: and it is as sufficient, and as learned, for us to say, it is expresly *and* in our Bible, and not *or*; and you do nothing if you confute us not, as you undertook, by the express words of our own Bible. How strangely do men forget what they promise, and what they are about? Besides, the *Fathers* from these very words prove *the necessity* * *of giving both the body and blood of Christ*: and attribute a distinct effect to each of them. Particularly the Author of the Comments under the name of St. *Ambrose*, in I. *Cor.* XI. *The flesh of Christ was delivered for the salvation of the body, and the blood was poured out for our souls.*

* *See late Treatise against Communion in one Kind.* Ch. 3.

He should have proved, not barely affirmed, that Christ gave the Sacrament to the Disciples at *Emaus*, XXIV. *Luke* 30, 35. We say he did not; though if he had, it is to be supposed there was *Wine* as well as *bread*: else it will prove it is lawful for their Church to *consecrate*, as well as to *give* the Communion, in one kind alone. Nor are there any of the ancient Interpreters who thus expound it. St. *Austin* and *Theophylact*, only apply it *allegorically* and *mystically* to the Sacrament (as *Jansenius* ingenuously acknowledges) the vertue of which may be

XXIV. Luke 30, 35.

be *here inſinuated* (as *Theophylact* phraſes it, not expreſly declared) *to enlighten the eyes of men.* The Author of the imperfect Work upon St. *Matthew* is thus to be underſtood: or elſe we muſt make St. *Paul*'s breaking bread in the Ship among the Soldiers and Mariners (Acts XXVIII.) to be *giving the Sacrament:* for that Writer joins this together with the other. The later *Scholaſtick* Writers, all expound it of *common breaking of bread*, ſuch as *Albertus Magnus*, *Bonaventure*, *Dionyſ. Cathuſianus*, nay *Tho. Aquinas* himſelf, whatſoever this man is pleaſed to ſay, as any one may be ſatisfied who can look into him, in *Tertull.* Diſt. XXI. Q. 55.

It is more impudence to quote II. *Act.* 42. to prove one kind to be ſufficient: when all acknowledge this Action was performed in the *Apoſtolical Aſſemblies*, by giving the Wine as well as the Bread. Therefore *breaking of bread* is uſed as a ſhort form of Speech, to ſignify they had Communion one with another, at the ſame holy Feaſt.

He durſt not here quote ſo much as one ſingle Father, as hitherto he hath done every where elſe: becauſe they are all manifeſtly againſt him. As not only *Caſſander*, and ſuch as he, acknowledge, but Cardinal

* *Rer. Liturg. l. 2. c. 18.*

Bonel * himself saith, that *Always and every where, from the beginning of the Church, to the Twelfth Century, the faithful communicated under the Species of Bread and Wine.*

XLI.

That there is not in the Church a true and proper Sacrifice; and that the Mass is not a Sacrifice.

Answer.

HE began to speak some truth in this Proposition, but could not hold out till he came to the end. Falshood is so natural to them, that it will not let them declare the whole truth, when that which they said already, would directly lead them to it. For having said, we do not believe there is a *true and proper Sacrifice* in the Church, why did he not conclude, that we deny the *Mass to be a proper Sacrifice?* This had been honest; for it is the very thing we have constantly said: because *proper sacrificing* is a destructive Act; by which that which is offered to God, is plainly destroyed; That is, so changed, that it ceases to

to be, what before it was. This they themſelves confeſs: and it is from this principle (among others) that we conclude, *there is no proper Sacrifice in the Sacrament.*

Malachy I. 11. It is manifeſt, from the current Conſent of the Ancient Interpreters, ſpeaks of an *improper* Sacrifice; *viz. prayer and thanksgiving*, repreſented by the *Incenſe*. So *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Euſebius*, *Chryſoſtome*, and divers others. His reaſoning upon this place therefore, is very childiſh: for the *Offering* here ſpoken of, is neither Chriſt ſacrificed on the *Croſs*, nor Chriſt in the *Sacrament*; for he cannot be often ſacrificed. But if we will apply it to the Sacrament, it is the *Commemorative Sacrifice* which is there made of the Sacrifice of Chriſt; with the Sacrifice of *Prayer*, *Praiſes*, *Thangsgivings*, and the *oblation of our ſelves*, Souls and Bodies to him. Such a Sacrifice we acknowledge is offered in the Holy Communion. Mal. I. 11.

The *Pſalmiſt* in CX. *Pſam* 4. ſpeaks of the Prieſthood of Chriſt, which endures for ever in Heaven (not of any Sacrificing Prieſt here on Earth) where he preſents himſelf to God, in the moſt holy place not made with hands. Nothing can be more contrary to the Scripture, than to ſay Pſal. CX. 4.

Melchisedeck sacrificed Bread and Wine: unless we will make his offering them to *Abraham* (unto whom he *brought them forth*, as several of the *Fathers* consent) to be a proper Sacrifice. But what dare not such men say, when he affirms, that Christ *exerciseth an eternal Priesthood upon Earth*, tho the Apostle expressly tells us the contrary, VIII. *Heb.* 4? Some of the Fathers indeed make an *Analogy* between the Bread and Wine in the *Eucharist*, and that which *Melchisedeck* brought forth: but this is against the *Popish* Notion, who will not have *Bread and Wine to be sacrificed in the Eucharist*, though the *Fathers* expressly say they are.

His Argument from XXII. *Luke* 19. is very idle. For when Christ saith, *This is my Body which is given for you*; the meaning is, which I have offered to be a Sacrifice to God (X. *John* 17.) and am about actually to give in Sacrifice for you. And so their own *Vulgar Interpreter* understood it, and translates this word, 1 *Cor.* XI. 24. *tradetur*, not which was *then given*, but was to *be given*, viz. to die. And so he constantly interprets the other part, not *is shed*, but *shall be shed*. And if he spake here in the next words (XXII. *Luke* 20. of what *was given* to the Apostles in the Sacrament, it would prove

prove that the Blood of Chriſt is ſhed in the Sacrament: which is directly contrary to their own Doctrine, which makes it an *unbloody Sacrifice.*

All the other Scriptures ſpeak of the *Prieſthood of Chriſt:* which none can exerciſe but Chriſt himſelf. *See* them who will, he will find this true.

Not one of his *Fathers* have a word of a *proper* Sacrifice; much leſs of a *Propitiatory*; but of a *reaſonable*, *unbloody*, *myſtical*, *heavenly* Sacriſtce: which proves the contrary to what they would have. As the *Fathers* do alſo, when they ſay it is a *Sacrifice*; and then immediately correct themſelves in ſome ſuch words as theſe, *or rather*, *a Commemoration of a Sacrifice* (*viz.* of Chriſt on the Croſs) *a Memorial*, *inſtead of a Sacrifice:* And thus *Aquinas* himſelf underſtood it.

XLII.

That Sacramental Unction is not to be uſed to the Sick.

Anſwer.

THERE are many things *Sacramental*, which are not *Sacraments:* and others called *Sacraments* by the Ancients, which

are not *properly* so; as the *Sign of the Cross*, *the Bread given to Catechumens*, *washing of the Saints Feet*, &c. because they were Signs and Symbols of some sacred thing. So was *Unction*; but not appointed by our Saviour to be a *Sacrament of the New Testament*. This he should have proved, if he could have perform'd any thing; and that it *confers grace from the work done*; or hath a power by Divine Institution, *to cause holiness and righteousness in us*, as the *Roman Catechism* defines a *Sacrament*. But it was impossible; and therefore he uses these dubious words, *Sacramental Unction:* which we see no reason to use; unless we could hope for such miraculous Cures, as were performed therewith by the Apostles.

V. Jam. 4. His first Text, V. *Jam.* 4. hath not a word of *Sacrament*, or *Sacramental* in it: and plainly speaks not of their *Extream Unction*, which is for the health of the *Soul*, when a man is a *dying:* but of *anointing* for the health of the *Body*, and the restoring a man to *life*. Therefore he might have spared his Discourse about the *matter* and *form*, &c. of a Sacrament: for *their Sacrament* is not here described, but an holy Rite, for a purpose as much different from theirs, as the Soul is from the Body, and Life from Death.

VI. *Mark*

VI. *Mark* 13. His own best Writers confess belongs not to this matter; containing only *an adumbration, and a figure of the Sacrament, but was not the Sacrament it self*, as *Menochius* expounds the place, according to the Doctrine of the *Council of* Trent, which saith, *this Sacrament* (as they call it) was insinuated in VI. *Mark*: *Now that is said to be insinuated, which is not expresly propounded* (mark that) *but adumbrated and obscurely indicated.* See how ignorant this man is, in his own Religion. Mark VI. 13.

XVI. *Mark* 18. makes not any mention of *anointing*, but only of *laying on of hands*: and yet this man hath the face to ask (as if the Cause were to be carried by impudence) if they *are not sick in their wits who oppose so plain Scriptures?* When nothing is plainer, than that these places speak of *Miraculous Cures*; as they themselves would confess, *If they would speak the truth* (to use his words) *and shame the Devil.* For Cardinal *Cajetan*, a man of no small learning, expresly declares, neither of the *two places* where *anointing* is mentioned, speak of *Sacramental Unction.* Particularly upon those words of St. *James* (which is the only place the best of them dare rely upon) he thus writes. "It doth not appear that he speaks *of the*

" *Sacramental Unction of Extream Unction*, ei-
" ther from the *words*, or from the *effect*:
" but rather of the Unction our Lord ap-
" pointed, in the Gospel, for the cure of
" the Sick. For the Text doth not say,
" *Is any man sick unto death*; but absolutely,
" *is any man sick?* And *the effect*, *was the relief of the sick man*, on whom forgiveness of sins was bestowed only *conditionally*: *Whereas Extream Unction is not given, but when a man is at the point of death, and directly tends, as its form sheweth, to remission of sins.* Besides, *St.* James *bids them call more Elders than one unto the sick man to pray, and anoint him; which is disagreeing to the Rite of Extream Unction.* Nothing but the force of truth could extort this ingenuous Interpretation from him: for he was no Friend to *Protestants*; but would not lie for the Service of his Cause. And before him, such Great men, as *Hugo de S. Victori*, *Bonaventure*, *Alex. Halensis*, *Altisiodor.* all taught, that *Extream Unction was not instituted by Christ.*

His *Fathers* say not a word of this Extream Unction. Both *Origen* and *Bede*, as *Estius* acknowledges, accommodate the words of St. *James* unto *the more grievous sort of sins, to the remission of which there is need of*

of the Miniſtry of the Keys; and ſo they refer it to another Sacrament (as they now call it) viz. *that of Abſolution.* *See* the Faith of this man, who thus endeavours to impoſe upon his Readers; as he doth alſo in the citing of St. *Chryſoſtome*, who ſaith the ſame with the other two; and of St. *Auſtin*, who only recites the Text of St. *James* in his Book *de Speculo*, without adding any words of his own to ſignify the ſenſe. As for the 215. *Serm. de Temp.* it is none of his. Next to this, he makes us ſay,

---

XLIII.

That no interior Grace is given by Impoſition of Hands, in Holy Orders. And that Ordinary Vocation, and Miſſion of Paſtors, is not neceſſary in the Church.

Anſwer.

HERE are *Two* Parts of this Propoſition; in *both* of which he notoriouſly ſlanders us; and in the *firſt* of them diſſembles their *own* Opinion. For we do not

not say, That *no interior Grace is given by Imposition of Hands*, in Holy Orders; but that *this is not a Sacrament, properly so called, conferring sanctifying Grace*; and that the outward Sign among them is not *Imposition of Hands*; but *delivering of the Patin and Chalice*, concerning which the Scripture speaks not a syllable. Nor is any man admitted to be a Pastor among us, but by a Solemn Ordination; wherein the Person to be ordained *Priest*, professes he thinks himself *truly called, according to the Will of our Lord*, &c. *unto that Order and Ministry*; and the Bishop when he lays hands on him, saith in so many words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, &c. which is the conferring that Grace, which they themselves call *gratis data*; and which the Apostle intends in the Scriptures he mentions.

1 Tim. IV. 14. In the *first* of which, 1 *Tim.* IV. 14. there is no express mention of *Grace*, (which he promis'd to show us in our Bible) but of a *Gift*. By which *Menochius* himself understands, *The Office and Order of a Bishop, the Authority and Charge of Teaching*. And so several of the Ancient Interpreters, such as *Theodoret*, St. *Chrysostom*, understands it: As others take it to signify extraordinary Gifts, such as those of *Tongues*, *Healing*, &c.

none

none think it ſpeaks of *ſanctifying Grace.* So that I may ſay (alluding to his own words) *See how plain it is*, that this Man doth not underſtand the Scripture! And hath made a mere *Rope of Sand* in his following reaſoning; for there is this Miſſion among us, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaks, viz. *A Deſignation unto a ſpecial Office, with Authority and Power to perform it.*

The Apoſtle ſpeaks of the ſame thing, in 2 *Tim.* I. 6. where there is no mention of *Grace* at all, but only of the *Gift of God*, which was in him. Which if we will call a *Grace*, (a word we diſlike not) it was not a Grace to *ſanctify*, but to *inable him to perform all the Offices belonging to that Order*, ex gr. *ſtrenuouſly to Preach the Goſpel, and to propagate the Faith*, &c. They are the words of the ſame *Menochius*; from whence I may take occaſion again to ſay, *See, how plain the Scripture is againſt him.* And how fouly he belies us, in ſaying that we affirm, *Laying on of Hands, not to be needful to them, who have already in them the Spirit of God.* For after the Biſhop hath askt the queſtion to one to be ordained *Deacon*, whether he *truſt that he is inwardly moved by the Holy Ghoſt, to take upon him that Office and Miniſtration,* 2 Tim. I. 6.

stration, &c. And he hath answer'd, *I trust so*; then the Bishop (after other Questions and Answers) *layeth hands on him.* Which is not to sanctify him, for that is supposed; but to impower him to execute the Office committed to him in the Church of God.

The Apostles words, V. *Hebr.* 4. are alledged after his manner, to prove what none of us deny, That no man may take this Office upon him, unless he be called to it.

They who have a mind to *see more*, may soon find that the rest of the Scriptures (some of which are the same again) prove nothing but a *Mission*, *by laying on of Hands*, which we practice. And one of them, 1 *Tim.* V. 22. can never be proved to belong to *Ordination*; being referred by many, of no small Name, to *Absolution.* For *Imposition of Hands* was used in giving that, as well as in giving Orders; which is an unanswerable Argument, that this is not a *Sacrament*; because the only sign that can be pretended out of Scripture, to belong unto it (viz. *Imposition of Hands*) is not proper to giving Orders, but common to other things.

None

None of his *Fathers*, nor any others, for many Ages, knew of more proper Sacraments, than *two* only. And therefore it is but to waſte Paper, and abuſe the Readers patience, to ſhow how impertinently thoſe, whom he mentions, are alledged.

XLIV.

That Prieſts, and other Religious Perſons, which have vowed their Chaſtity to God, may freely Marry, notwithſtanding their Vow.

Anſwer.

THERE is no ſuch looſe Doctrine among us: But we ſay, That it is *free for Prieſts to Marry, as well as other Perſons*; for *Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled.* Which ſignifies, we think, that *Chaſtity may be preſerved in Marriage, as well as in Virginity.* Therefore, we further ſay, no man ought raſhly to Vow he will never marry, when he is not ſure of his power to contain For *this is not given to all*, as Chriſt himſelf ſaith, XIX. *Mat.* 11. but *every one hath his prrper gift from God*;

one

stration, &c. And he hath answer'd, *I trust so*; then the Bishop (after other Questions and Answers) *layeth hands on him.* Which is not to sanctify him, for that is supposed; but to impower him to execute the Office committed to him in the Church of God.

The Apostles words, V. *Hebr.* 4. are alledged after his manner, to prove what none of us deny, That no man may take this Office upon him, unless he be called to it.

They who have a mind to *see more*, may soon find that the rest of the Scriptures (some of which are the same again) prove nothing but a *Mission*, *by laying on of Hands*, which we practice. And one of them, 1 *Tim.* V. 22. can never be proved to belong to *Ordination*; being referred by many, of no small Name, to *Absolution.* For *Imposition of Hands* was used in giving that, as well as in giving Orders; which is an unanswerable Argument, that this is not a *Sacrament*; because the only sign that can be pretended out of Scripture, to belong unto it (viz. *Imposition of Hands*) is not proper to giving Orders, but common to other things.

None

None of his *Fathers*, nor any others, for many Ages, knew of more proper Sacraments, than *two* only. And therefore it is but to waſte Paper, and abuſe the Readers patience, to ſhow how impertinently thoſe, whom he mentions, are alledged.

XLIV.

That Prieſts, and other Religious Perſons, which have vowed their Chaſtity to God, may freely Marry, notwithſtanding their Vow.

Anſwer.

THERE is no ſuch looſe Doctrine among us: But we ſay, That it is *free for Prieſts to Marry, as well as other Perſons*; for *Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled.* Which ſignifies, we think, that *Chaſtity may be preſerved in Marriage, as well as in Virginity.* Therefore, we further ſay, no man ought raſhly to Vow he will never marry, when he is not ſure of his power to contain For *this is not given to all*, as Chriſt himſelf ſaith, XIX. *Mat.* 11. but *every one hath his prrper gift from God*;

one

one after this manner, another after that, 1 Cor. VII. 7. If any one hath made such a Vow, we say, he ought to use his endeavours to keep it; but if he cannot without Sin, he ought to Marry; for in this case, the matter of his Vow ceases. This is our Doctrine, which is not contrary to the Scripture.

XXIII. Deut. 22. There is mention of a *Vow*, in XXIII. *Deut.* 22. but not *of Chastity*, which he undertook to show us *expressly* in our Bible. Alas! that was impossible; and so he falls a talking of Vows about other matters. And yet, even in such Vows as this, whereof *Moses* speaks, if a Person was not in his own power, or vowed a thing impossible for him to give, or a thing not acceptable to God, he was not bound by his Vow.

1 Tim. V. 11, 12. The next place, 1 *Tim.* V. 11, 12. is against him. For the Apostle would not have Widows taken into the Office of *Deaconesses*, when they were young (as the *Church of Rome* lets Boys and Girls of Sixteen years old, vow Virginity) but requires *Timothy* to refuse such, if they offered themselves to that Service, and take in none under the Age of *Sixty*; when it was likely they would have no mind to change their

their Condition, as the younger would be apt to do. Who thereby; became guilty of a *great fault* (as *Menochius* expounds, *having Damnation*) in departing from the Covenant they had made, to devote themſelves to the Service of the Church. For *they had not choſen Widowhood with the Judgment of Reaſon, or juſt Conſideration*, (as *Theophylact* gloſſes) in which caſe the Apoſtle allows them to Marry, *v.* 14. Upon which the ſame *Theophylact* thus again Paraphraſes; *In the firſt place, I wiſh they would not make void their Contracts* (or Covenants) *but becauſe they deſire Marriage, I deſire it alſo, condeſcending to them. For it is better they ſhould be Miſtreſſes of Families, that is, look after their own Houſe, and Labour, than running about to other Folks Houſes, be trifling and idle.* Which is the ſenſe of more Ancient Fathers than he; particularly of St. *Cyprian*, who ſpeaks of Virgins, that after they had dedicated themſelves to God, were found in bed with men, ſaith, *It was better for them to Marry, than to fall into the Fire by their Offences* *. His Maſter, *Tertullian*, ſaith the ſame, ſpeaking of this very Text. Nay, St. *Auſtin*, tho he do not approve of Marriage after a Vow, yet reſolves that ſuch a Marriage is not to be diſſolved.

* Epiſt. ad Pompon.

And

one after this manner, another after that, 1 Cor. VII. 7. If any one hath made ſuch a Vow, we ſay, he ought to uſe his endeavours to keep it; but if he cannot without Sin, he ought to Marry; for in this caſe, the matter of his Vow ceaſes. This is our Doctrine, which is not contrary to the Scripture.

XXIII. Deut. 22.

There is mention of a *Vow*, in XXIII. *Deut.* 22. but not *of Chaſtity*, which he undertook to ſhow us *expreſly* in our Bible. Alas! that was impoſſible; and ſo he falls a talking of Vows about other matters. And yet, even in ſuch Vows as this, whereof *Moſes* ſpeaks, if a Perſon was not in his own power, or vowed a thing impoſſible for him to give, or a thing not acceptable to God, he was not bound by his Vow.

1 Tim V. 11, 12.

The next place, 1 *Tim.* V. 11, 12. is againſt him. For the Apoſtle would not have Widows taken into the Office of *Deaconeſſes*, when they were young (as the *Church of Rome* lets Boys and Girls of Sixteen years old, vow Virginity) but requires *Timothy* to refuſe ſuch, if they offered themſelves to that Service, and take in none under the Age of *Sixty*; when it was likely they would have no mind to change their

their Condition, as the younger would be apt to do. Who thereby; became guilty of a *great fault* (as *Menochius* expounds, *having Damnation*) in departing from the Covenant they had made, to devote themſelves to the Service of the Church. For *they had not choſen Widowhood with the Judgment of Reaſon, or juſt Conſideration,* (as *Theophylact* gloſſes) in which caſe the Apoſtle allows them to Marry, *v.* 14. Upon which the ſame *Theophylact* thus again Paraphraſes; *In the firſt place, I wiſh they would not make void their Contracts* (or Covenants) *but becauſe they deſire Marriage, I deſire it alſo, condeſcending to them. For it is better they ſhould be Miſtreſſes of Families, that is, look after their own Houſe, and Labour, than running about to other Folks Houſes, be trifling and idle.* Which is the ſenſe of more Ancient Fathers than he; particularly of St. *Cyprian*, who ſpeaks of Virgins, that after they had dedicated themſelves to God, were found in bed with men, ſaith, *It was better for them to Marry, than to fall into the Fire by their Offences* *. His Maſter, *Tertullian*, ſaith the ſame, ſpeaking of this very Text. Nay, St. *Auſtin*, tho he do not approve of Marriage after a Vow, yet reſolves that ſuch a Marriage is not to be diſſolved.

* Epiſt. ad Pompon.

And

And their own *Doctors* determine, That *when a thing is unprofitable, and hinders a greater good, what is promised by a Vow, ought not to be kept.* Upon which their *Dispensations* are founded, even in this solemn Vow of Chastity.

1 Tim. V. 15: I have said the more of this, because it answers what he pretends out of the 15th verse of the same Chapter; where the Apostle doth not call their Marrying, *turning aside after Satan.* For he had just before given them leave, or rather advised them to Marry, lest they should *give occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully*, &c. that is, as *Theophylact* explains it, Give the *Devil occasion to make a mock of them, by drawing them into Adultery, through the unstedfastness of Youth.* And for this very reason, he thinks the Apostle endeavoured to bring them under the yoke of Marriage (as his Phrase is) lest being left loose, they should run into the aforesaid mischiefs.

By this the Reader may be convinced, with what Honesty this man quotes the *Fathers*, and reproaches those that Marry, (after they have unadvisedly devoted themselves to single life) as *God's Adulterers*; when they say the Apostle directs them to Marry, that they may not be such *Adulterers.*

In

In all the other Scriptures which he would have us see, there is not one that speaks of the *Vow of Chastity*: But of Vow of Offering Sacrifice, or of being *Nazarites* (which was in some cases but for a time) or such like things, as any one may satisfy himself that will read the places.

We and the *Fathers* do not differ in this point, as I have already said; and therefore I will not swell this Book by an unnecessary account of what they say, in the places he mentions.

XLV.

That Fasting and Abstinence from certain Meats, is not grounded on Holy Scripture, nor causeth any Spiritual Good.

Answer.

FAsting, that is, Abstinence *from all Meat and Drink*, is grounded on Scripture, and doth much good: But Fasting, or Abstinence from *certain Meats* only, is

not Fasting, and hath no ground in Scripture, nor do we see any Spiritual Good in it; but, rather much hurt, because it cheats men into a belief that they *Fast*, when they *Feast*.

XXXV. Jer. 5. The Prophet, XXXV. *Jer.* 5. doth not speak of fasting from any Meat whatsoever, but of a total forbearance of all Wine, and from dwelling in Houses, or having any Land, *&c.* And all this, not out of Religion, but for a Civil Reason, as the very Text tells us, *v.* 7. Which laid no Obligation upon other People so to do, no not upon the *Israelites*, muchless upon us *Christians*; being an Injunction to *one Family* only, by the Father of it. Are not these men rare Interpreters of Scripture, who expound it at this rate, and apply it to any purpose; for this very case, just before, was brought to prove the *Obligation of Vows*.

The next place, I. *Luke* 15. is alledged as sillily. For it proves too much; an Abstinence, which no man thinks himself bound unto, from all Wine and Strong Drink, as long as he lives. Which *John Baptist* himself would not have practised, had he not been disigned to an austere sort of Life, after the manner of the Ancient *Nazarites*, as *Menochius*

chius expounds this place. It is a wonder, when there are ſo many Texts that ſpeak of *Faſting*, this man ſhould pick out ſuch as theſe, which have no reſpect unto it.

The next indeed hath, XIII. *Acts* 3. and accordingly we have our Faſts before every Ordination, in the *Ember* weeks.

XVII. *Matth.* 27. proves nothing, but that upon extraordinary occaſions, there muſt be extraordinary Prayer and Faſting; which we alſo both affirm and practice.

The reſt of his Scriptures, and his *Fathers*, I aſſure the Reader, ſay nothing that we deny; but he had a mind to ſlander us, as if we were Enemies to Faſting; when we Faſt *truly*, by total Abſtinence from Meat and Drink on our Faſting-days, they Faſt only *nominally*, eating all ſorts of Fiſh, and drinking Wine on their Faſting-days. Whereby they hope alſo, to *ſatisfy for their Sins, and to merit a Cœleſtial Reward*; as *Bellarmine* ſpeaks in his *Second* Book of *Good Works*. Why did he not prove this end of Faſting, and not ſpend his time about that which is not queſtioned; for we acknowledg that *Faſting is good, if rightly deſigned.*

XLVI.

That Jeſus Chriſt deſcended not into Hell nor delivered thence the Souls of the Fathers.

Anſwer.

WHat an impudent Lyar is this, to ſay we deny that which is an Article of our Creed, profeſſed by us every day, That *Chriſt did deſcend into Hell*? Not indeed, to deliver the Souls of the *Fathers* in *Limbo*; becauſe we read of no ſuch thing in any of the Scriptures which he mentions.

Epheſ. IV. 8. The Apoſtle in IV. *Epheſ.* 8. ſays nothing either of their *Limbus*, or of the *Souls of the Fathers*; but of *leading captivity captive.* Which hath no relation to the Souls either of the *glorified*, or of the *damned*, but of ſuch men and women as we are: Whom *Chriſt did not captivate, when we were free* (ſaith *Theodoret* upon the place) *but being under the power of the Devil, he reſcued us; and making us his captives, beſtowed liberty upon us.* To the ſame purpoſe *Theophylact*, but a little larger, (comprehending all our enemies)

mies) *What captivity doth the Apoſtle mean? That of the Devil: For he took the Devil captive, and Death, and the Curſe, and Sin, and us, who were under the Devils Power, and obnoxious to the forenamed enemies.*

The next place, II. *Acts* 27. only proves our Saviour deſcended into Hell, but ſaith nothing of the *Fathers* being there. What St. *Auſtin* ſaith, is not the buſineſs, but what the Scripture ſaith *expreſsly*. Yet the words which he quotes out of him, touch not us. who believe Chriſt's Deſcent into Hell, as much or more than himſelf. And it is worth the noting, how in this very place where he calls it *Infidelity to deny Chriſt's going into Hell*, he overthrows this end of it, (to fetch the Fathers from thence); for he profeſſes he could find the name of *Hell* no where given unto that place where the ſouls of righteous men did reſt. II. Acts 27.

There is no mention in 1 *Pet.* 3. 18, 19. of ſo much as Chriſt's deſcending into Hell, but only of his *Preaching to the ſpirits in priſon*; and that not *in perſon*, but by *that Spirit* which raiſed him from the dead. St. *Auſtin* wiſhes us to conſider (in that very Epiſtle which he juſt now named, XCIX. *ad Euod.*) *leſt perhaps all that which the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the ſpirits ſhut up in priſon, who did* 1 Pet. III. 18, 19.

not believe in the days of Noah, *do not at all belong to hell, but rather unto those times* (of Noah) *whose pattern he applies to our times.* And this St. *Hierom* relates as the opinion of a most prudent man; and is followed by *Bede*, *Walfridus*, *Strabo*, and others. And if this place should not be thus interpreted of his *Preaching by his Spirit in the Ministry of* Noah *unto the old world*, but of his own Preaching unto the spirits in hell, it must be to the damned spirits (for we read of no others there) as a great many Ancient Writers, through mistake of this place, conceived: And this is as much against his opinion, as against ours.

The XI. *Heb.* 39, 40. proves no more, but that they had not their compleat happiness; yet were not in *Hell*, as that signifies any thing of torment; but in *Heaven*, tho not in the highest felicity of it. Thus *Theodoret*, and others of the Ancients understand it: *Tho the combats of these men were so many and so great, yet they received not their Crowns: For the God of the Universe*, saith he, *expects till others have finished their race, that then he may solemnly declare them all together to be Conquerors.* Which *Theophylact* thus farther enlargeth, *Is not God unjust then unto them, if they who have got the start in labours,*

hours, muſt expect us in Crowns? No ſuch matter, for this is very acceptable unto them, to be perfected with their brethren; we are one body, and the pleaſure is greater to the body, if all its members be crowned together, &c. but God gave to thoſe who preceded us in labours, a certain foretaſte, bidding them wait for the compleat banquet till their brethren come to them. And they being lovers of mankind, joyfully expect (note that) *that they may be all merry together.* This plainly ſhows ſuch men as theſe did not look upon the *Fathers* as in *Hell*, but in *Heaven*, in a ſtate of joy; tho not conſummate, but in expectation of its completion. I could ſhow this to be the ſenſe which men in his own Church put upon this place; but I am afraid of being tedious, and therefore ſhall make ſhorter work of the reſt.

Jonas, mentioned XII. *Matth.* 40. was a Type of Chriſt's *Death*, *Burial*, and *Reſurrection*; and the *Whale's belly* repreſented his *Grave*, and nothing elſe. So *Menochius* acknowledges, That tho many by the heart of the earth, underſtand the *Limbus of the Fathers*, yet others take it for *the Grave*. As *Ignatius* doth, in that very Epiſtle which he quotes preſently, and St. *Chryſoſtome*, to name no more. XII. Mat. 40.

St. *Matthew*, XXVII. 52. speaks of the Resurrection of many out of their Graves; but whence their Souls came, neither he nor *Ignatius* say a word.

IX. Zach. 11. There is no reason to think that IX. *Zach.* 11. speaks of *fetching souls out of the infernal prison*; but *Theodoret* saith expressly, That if by the *Pit* or *Lake*, we shall understand either *Eternal Death*, or *Idolatry*, we shall not miss the mark. *For when men were bound in this lake, our Lord Christ loosed them and brought them out; and bestowed liberty upon them by his Precious Blood, and sent them forth into the way of life, when he gave them the New Testament.* And so St. *Austin** thinks it is best understood, *of the profundity of human misery.* And I assure the Reader, that both St. *Hierom*, and St. *Cyril*, (to the great shame of this false Writer) understand this place, as *Theodoret* doth.

* L. XVIII. *de Civit. Dei*, c. 25.

1 Sam. II. 6. 1 *Sam.* II. 6. is very foolishly applied to this matter; for the plain meaning is, as *Menochius* acknowledgeth, That *God, if he pleaseth, raises dead men to life again*; or by way of Allegory, *he restoreth unhappy and miserable men to a hapyy and flourishing condition, according to his will*: As in the next verse (saith he) is more clearly repeated, *he raiseth up the poor out of the dust*, &c. that is,

is, *from a low condition.* He did not think it abſurd to underſtand the *Grave*, by that word which they tranſlate *Hell*; concerning which it is not proper now to diſpute, becauſe he promiſed to confute us out of *our own* Bible, not out of *theirs*. Nor is it fit to trouble our ſelves about the reſt of his *Scriptures* (which he barely names, and ſome of the very ſame over again) or his *Fathers*, which we have ſeen he alledges withour Judgment or Fidelity.

XLVII.

That there is no Purgatory fire, or other Priſon, wherein Sins may be ſatisfied for, after this life.

Anſwer.

VEry right; and there is nothing either in *Scripture* or *Antiquity* to prove it.

The fire ſpoke of, 1 *Cor.* III. 13. is by their own Authors interpreted, to ſignify *the fire at the day of Judgment*, in the Conflagration of the World. So *Menochius* and *Eſtius* expreſsly diſputes againſt the application of this to *Purgatory*. Nor doth one of the Ancient 1 Cor. III. 13.

Ancient *Fathers*, in the *Six first Centuries* so understand it; but all apply the words to other purposes. St. *Austin* in a great many places, particularly in his *Enchiridion* * expounds it of *the tribulations of this life*, and that *grief, wherewith a man's mind is stung, when he loses those things which he dearly loves*; And hence saith, it is not incredible, that some such thing may be after this life; but whether it be so or no, he leaves it to every ones inquiry. Which demonstrates, he did not look on this, as an Article of Faith, but as a thing uncertain; and it is certain, understood these words of St. *Paul* otherways. And in the place he here mentions, *Psalm* 37. it is evident he speaks of the *fire at the end of the world*, as any one may see who will look into it.

* *Cap.* 67, 68. *&c.*

The *Learned reasoning* (as he esteems it) of *Card. Allen* upon XI. *John* 22. is so frivolous, that it shows how impossible it is, with all the Learning or Wit in the world, to make good their Cause. For *Martha*'s Speech, any one may see without much Learning, hath respect to the *Resurrection* of her Brother out of his Grave, not *to Praying for his Soul in Purgatory*: Which if she learnt in the *Synagogue*, we have the less reason to receive it: Especially if she

XI. John 22.

was

was then ſo ignorant, as he ſaith ſhe was, that ſhe did not know our Saviour to be the *Son of God.*

It might be ſufficient to Anſwer to the next place, II. *Acts* 24. that he falſifies our Bible, to make a ſhow of an Argument againſt us, for we Tranſlate thoſe words, *God hath raiſed him up, having looſed the pains of death*; not as he reports it, *the ſorrows of hell.* And St. *Chryſoſtom*, with other of the Ancients, juſtify our Tranſlation, when by the pains of *Hades*, they underſtand *Death*; which ſuffered grievouſly by Chriſt's Reſurrection from the dead. *Menochius* himſelf puts in both words, and ſaith; *The pains of death and of hell*, are by a Metanymy, *moſt grievous pains:* So that the ſenſe is, *God raiſed up Chriſt, death and hell being overcome, with all the pains that attend it; he looſing, that is, making void whatſoever death had done by its pains and torments.* See by what pitiful wreſting of Scripture theſe men maintain their Doctrine: Applying that to Chriſt's looſing others, which is evidently ſpoken of God's looſing him *from the bands of death* (as the plaineſt meaning is) for it was not poſſible he ſhould *be held* by it, as the next words explain it. II. Acts 24.

If

If those words, *baptized for the dead*,
1 Cor. XV. 29. 1 *Cor.* XV. 29. afforded such an *evident proof*, as he pretends, *of the help which the Souls departed out of this world, may receive by the Church on Earth*, for their deliverance out of Purgatory: It is a wonder that not so much as one of the Ancient Interpreters, thought of this sense of the words, among the very many they have given; but every one carry the sense another way. St *Chrysostom*, with many other of the *Greek* Writers, and some of the *Latin*, expound them of the *solemn Baptism of the Faithful*; which is said to be *for the dead*, because they are all Baptized into the belief *of the Resurrection of the dead*. This is a plain and natural Interpretation: Whereas this man's sense of the word *Baptized*, is violently forc'd and strain'd. For to *be Baptized*, no where signifies *to afflict ones self*, or to *do penance*. Our Saviour indeed saith he had a *baptism to be baptized withal*: But he doth not call any sort of afflictions by this name, much less speaks of *afflicting himself*, but of his *suffering death*. And if we thus understand the word *Baptize* in this place of the Apostle; *Guillandus*, a Doctor of his own Church (to name none of ours) hath given this probable Interpre-

pretation of thoſe *who were Baptized for the dead*; that they were ſuch, as did not ſtick to *ſuffer Martyrdom, for the defence of their belief of the Reſurrection of the dead.*

There are very few Scholars in the Roman Church, who adventure to alledge XVI. *Luke* 9. for a proof of *Purgatory*. For it is manifeſt, ſaith *Maldonate*, That *the Poor, are the friends, who are to receive us into everlaſting habitations*. That is, we ſhall be received thither, for our Charity to *them*. And in this he ſays, *all Authors conſent*, except St. *Ambroſe*, whoſe ſingular opinion it is, that they are the *Holy Angels*, which is deſervedly rejected by all: And yet this poor Creature follows that rejected opinion; (elſe why doth he quote St. *Ambroſe*)? though it makes nothing for his purpoſe; Which is to prove, not what *Angels*, but what *we on earth* can do for the help of the dead. After the like ſenſeleſs manner he alledgeth St. *Auſtin*, who ſaith not a word of *Purgatory* in the place he names: But mentioning a *double order of thoſe that ſhall be ſaved*, he ſaith, ſome have lived in ſuch ſanctity, that they may help their friends to be received into everlaſting habitations; and others lived not ſo well, as to have been ſufficient to attain ſo great a bleſſedneſs, XVI. Luk. 9.

ness, unless they had obtained mercy by *the Merits*, that is, the *Prayers* (as *Bellarmine* acknowledges) of their Friends. Now what is this to *Purgatory*? Unless it can be proved that there is no way to receive Mercy from God, but by passing through that fire, of which he saith nothing. How the word *fail* in this Text, inforceth, as he fancies, receiving succor after death, I cannot conceive. For it signifies our dying, as *Menochius* himself expounds it; *departing this life*, as *Theophylact*, who knew of no other sense, unless it be understood, saith he, of Pusillanimity being condemn'd.

Nor doth St. *Austin* in the next place, XXIII. *Luke* 44. say that Souls may be holpen in Purgatory: But expressly declares, *if no sin were to be remitted in the last judgment*, our Lord would not have said of a certain sin, it shall not be remitted in this world, nor in the world to come. Which the Thief hoped for, when he Prayed, *Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.* And if the Theif had any such erroneous Notion in his head (which we do not believe) of *going to Purgatory*, when he died; our Lord presently freed him from that false conceit, by that gracious promise, *This day shalt thou be with me in Paradice.* It

It is a lamentable Cause which must be supported by such an Author as *Jason* of *Cyrene*, whose Book is of no credit. But if it were, the place he cites, 2 *Maccab.* XII. 44, 45. proves nothing but *Prayer for the dead*, which doth not infer a *Purgatory*. For the *Greeks* use *Prayer for the dead*, who believe nothing of *Purgatory*. And indeed the Text it self tells us, their Prayers had respect, not to the deliverance of those Prayed for out of the flames of Purgatory, but *to their Resurrection*: And if they had believed Purgatory, they could not, according to the Popish opinion, have prayed for these men who died in mortal Sin; being defiled by things belonging to Idols, which were found under their Garments. Now the Romish Church doth not admit such people as die in mortal Sin, into *Purgatory*. *See* how weak all their proofs are, of this great Article of their Faith. For there is no greater strength to be found in the rest of his *Texts*, which he hath jumbled together, after a very strange fashion, as if a long row of Chapters and Verses would do his business. Nor did the *Fathers* in the Six first Ages, know any thing of this Doctrine. *Gregory* indeed, called the *Great*, began to talk of it, and laid the

the foundation of it: But his Authority is not great, being much addicted to *Fables*, and relying upon pretended *Revelations*, *Visions*, and *Apparitions*. And as for *Origen*'s Purgatory, St. *Austin* saith, * *What Catholick Christian is there, whether learn'd or unlearn'd, who doth not vehemently abhor it?* And yet this man is not ashamed to alledge his Testimony; by which the Reader may make a judgment of the rest.

* *De hæres. c.* 43.

XLVIII.

That it is not lawful to make, or have Images.

Answer.

THIS is another shameless slander, as his own *Bellarmin* confesses; who says, the opinion of *Calvin* himself is this, *That Images are not simply forbidden, but he admits only of an Historical use of them.* The sum of our Doctrine is this, That *it is not lawful to make an Image of God* (and so some of their own Church have confessed) *nor to make any Image to be worshipped.* If we should

L. 2. *de Eccles. Triumph. c.* 8.

ſhould have further added, That *it is unlawful to make or have Images, becauſe of the danger of Idolatry*, we could have juſtified our ſelves by the Authority of as wiſe men, as any in their Church. For more than one of the Ancient *Fathers* were of this opinion; who were never condemned by the Ancient Church, nor was this reckoned among their Errors.

His Texts of Scripture are impertinently alledged. For God might command that to be done (XXV. *Exod.* 18.) which he forbad them to do, without ſuch a ſpecial Order. And there is no proof that *the Cherubins* were made with *Faces of beautiful young men*, as this Writer aſſerts; but the contrary is apparent, as many have demonſtrated. He belies St. *Hierom* alſo, when he makes him ſay, the *Jews worſhipped them*: which the beſt of their own Authors deny. Particularly *Lorinus*, a famous Jeſuit, upon XVII. *Acts* 25. *Concerning the Cherubims made by God's Command, and other Images made by Solomon, it muſt be ſaid, that they were only an Appendix, and additional ornament of another thing: and were not of themſelves propounded for adoration; which it is manifeſt the Hebrews did not give them.* And *Vaſquez* ſaith the ſame out of *Tertullian*, that XXV. Exod. 18.

no worship was given to the *Cherubims*; alledging no less than *twelve Schoolmen* of that opinion. Why should I trouble my self therefore any further with such a Writer, whose next Scriptures are still about the *Cherubims*, and therefore are already answered? For he doth not believe, I hope, that when the Apostle, IX. *Hebr.* 1. speaks of the *Ordinances of Divine Service*, that is, *Commandments about the Worship of God* (as *Theodoret*, and from him *Menochius* expounds it) and after many other things, mentions *the Cherubims of glory*, he intended they should have *divine service* performed to them. If not, then his observation is frivolous; for no body denies there were such things as *Cherubims* in the most holy place: where no body saw them, much less worshipped them.

When he hath done with his Scriptures, he goes about to prove (so fond he is of Images) that *an Image is of divine and natural right*, because we always form one in our mind, when we *conceive and understand* any thing. As if it were all one to form an Idea invisibly in the mind; and to make a visible, standing representation of it, in Wood, Brass, or Stone. Such Writers tire one with their folly and falshood: which

is

is notorious in what he quotes out of Saint *Austin* in the conclusion of this Chapter; Who taking notice that some Pagans had forged a Story of I know not what Books, written by Christ to *Peter* and *Paul*, concerning the secret Arts of working Miracles, says they named those two perhaps rather than other Apostles, to whom those pretended Books were directed, because they might have *seen them painted with Him in many places*. Which, whether it be meant in private Houses (as is most probable) or in publick places, it is manifest St. *Austin* did not regard such Pictures; for he presently adds, in the very next sentence (which this false Writer conceals) these remarkable words: *Thus they deserved to err utterly, who sought for Christ and his Apostles, not in the holy Books, but in painted Walls. And it is no wonder, if they that counterfeit* (in forging Books he means) *were deceived by them that paint.*

XLIX.

That it is not lawful to reverence Images, nor to give any honour to insensible things.

Answer.

NOW we are come indeed to the business: but they seem afraid to touch it. For, *first*, instead of saying, it is not lawful to *worship Images* (as it was before, when Bishop *Montague* answered this Book) now they dwindle it into *reverence* of them. And *then*, they fallaciously tack to this a Proposition of another nature, that *no honour is to be given to insensible things*. Which is a new Calumny; for we do upon some occasions give *honour* or *respect* (tho no *Worship*, nor *Adoration*) to things that have no sense in them.

Therefore he might have kept to himself his *first* Scripture, which is brought to prove *this*; not the *worshipping* of any Creature. For *putting off the shooes* was a respect paid to earthly Princes in those Countries, when they came into their presence.

Exod. III. 5.

In the next place XCIX. *Psal.* 5. instead of *our* Translation, *Worship at his footstool* (which he promised to stick unto) he gives us *their own*, *Adore the footstool of his feet*; expressly

Ps. XCIX. 5.

preſly contrary to the Original, and to the moſt ancient Tranſlations; particularly the *Chaldee* Paraphraſe, which runs thus; *adore*, or *worſhip in the Houſe of his Sanctuary, for he is holy.* Which is ſo plain and literal an Interpretation, that *Janſenius* and *Lorinus* himſelf follow it. And they, among the Ancients, who follow the *Vulgar* Tranſlation, thought it ſo horrible a thing to *worſhip his Footſtool*) thereby underdanding the *Earth*, which is called *God's footſtep*, that they expound theſe words of Chriſt. Hear St. *Auſtin* upon the place. *I am afraid to worſhip the Earth, leſt he that made Heaven and Earth condemn me;* (obſerve that) *and yet I am afraid not to worſhip the Footſtool of my Lord, becauſe the* Pſalmiſt *ſaith, Worſhip the Footſtool of his Feet. What therefore ſhall I do? In this doubt, I turn my ſelf to Chriſt, whom here I ſeek, and find; how without impiety the Earth may be worſhipped; without Impiety may be worſhipped the Footſtool of his Feet; For he took Earth from the Earth, Fleſh being of the Earth: and he took Fleſh of the Fleſh of Mary.* He muſt have a brow of braſs, if he can read this, and not be put out of countenance. But if they had any ſhame left, they would not draw in St. *Hierom* to countenance this Impiety; Whom this man quotes again

(though he tells us not in what Epistle to *Marcella* we may find it) to prove *that the Ark was worshipped in regard of the Images that were set upon it*, that is, the *Cherubims*. A foul Forgery! For he only saith, *the Tabernacle was venerated*; that is, had in honourable regard, *because the Cherubims were there*. Veneration is one thing, and Religious Worship is another: And his meaning is no more than this, that *they reverenced the Sanctuary* (as God commanded *Moses*) *because of a Divine presence there*. It was the more impudent to alledg him, because he is the *Father* who saith *, *We have one Husband, and we worship one Image: which is the Image of the Invisible, Omnipotent God*; i. e. Christ.

* *L. IV. in Ezek. c. 16.*

What he intends by alledging, II. *Philip.* 10. for a proof that *Images are to be worshipped*, I cannot imagine: unless he be so senseless, as to take the *Name* of a thing, for an *Image* of it. And he could not but know also, that when we bow at the Name of *Jesus*, we worship our Lord Christ.

His long Discourse of the *brazen Serpent*, mentioned XXI. *Numb.* 8. is as impertinent. For there is no proof that it was an Image, nor the least signification that it was set up to be worshipped. If it were, why did *Hezekiah* break it in pieces; for that very reason

Numb. XXI. 8.

son, because, in process of time, People burnt incense to it? He ought to have known also, That *Vasquez* (as I shew'd before) together with *Azorius*, both learned *Jesuits*, with a great many other of the best Writers of his own Church, acknowledge that *no Image among the Jews was set up for worship.* And *Azorius* expressly confutes his most learned Dr. *Saunders*, for abusing the Testimony of some *Fathers* to prove the contrary. As this man doth those whom he hath named, particularly their Pope *Gregory the Great:* who is known to all the World to have been against the *Worship of Images*; though he earnestly contended to have them in Churches. But I refer the Reader to Bishop *Montague* for satisfaction about his *Fathers* (some of which are forged, others say nothing to the purpose, and *John Damascen* was no Father, but a superstitious Monk) because, contrary to his custome, he takes notice of some of our *Objections* against *Image-worship*, and endeavours to *answer* them; which may seem to require consideration, though I think the most ordinary Reader might be left to grapple with him.

His *Answer* to the *first* Objection, of *Hezekiah's* breaking the brazen Serpent, seeing

it the cause of Idolatry, if it have any sense in it, is an audacious reflection upon that good King; nay, upon the Holy Ghost, who commends him for what he did: Whereas this man going about to prove, that the abuse of a good thing, ought not to take away the use of it, doth as good as say, *Hezekiah* should not have broken it, but left it as a Monument of God's Mercy to them, without destroying it. What is this but censuring *him*, instead of answering *us?*

His Answer to the *next*, is an impudent denial of their Principles, and of their Practice. For their greatest Writers say, it is the constant Opinion of Divines, that *the Image is to be worshipped with the same worship wherewith that is worshipped of which it is the Image.* So *Azorius*.

The *third* is no Answer to what we charge upon them, but a false Charge upon us; Who do not fall down before the *Sacrament*, and worship it as an Image of Christ; but worship Christ himself, when we receive it upon our Knees.

The *Fourth* is a fresh piece of Impudence; in denying Images to be set up in Churches *with a special intent, that People should worship or adore them*: and in affirming, That *the worship is given them, as it were, by a consequence*;

quence; and rather, because it may be lawfully given, than because it is principally sought to be given. For their great Cardinal *Bellarmin* *, to name no other, expressly saith, That the *Images of Christ, and of the Saints, are honoured, not only by accident, and improperly, but* per se, *and properly: so that they terminate the Veneration, as they are considered in themselves; and not only as they represent their Exemplar.* And their Opinion savours of Heresie in that Church, who say *that they are not set up to be worshipped.* Of which this man, I believe, was sensible, when he tells us, *They are partly set up in Churches, to stir up our minds to follow the Example of those holy men, whose Images we behold.* Which supposes this not the *whole* end for which they are set up; but that they are *partly* intended for another purpose. What that is, he durst not confess; for fear he should confute himself: For he knew that the *stirring up of Peoples minds to follow the Saints*, is but a small part of the reason for which Images are set up in Churches: the great end is, that *they may be worshipped.*

* *L. 2. de Imag. c. 21, 22.*

His distinction between an *Idol* and an *Image*, is as vain as all the rest (as our Authors have demonstrated a thousand times) and that they do not give *Latria* to Images, is

is another egregious untruth: for they expresly say in the *Ceremoniale*, that *Latria is due to the Cross*: for which reason it is ordered to take place of the *Imperial Sword*, when they are both carried together.

Neither he, nor any any one else (whatsoever he vapours) dare *break in pieces, or tear a Crucifix, or Picture*, solemnly consecrated to be worshipped: not with an *inferior sort of Worship* (as he pretends); for that, the greatest Men in his Church acknowledge is down-right Idolatry. And therefore maintain, that the Image, and the Person represented by it, are worshipped *as one Object, with the same act of worship.*

What the *Council of Trent* saith, hath been considered by a number of our Writers, who have shown, that the *Prayers* wherewith Images are consecrated, the *Pilgrimages* that are made to them, the *Prayers to the Wood of the Cross*, do suppose they expect *vertue*, yea very great benefit from them: and that, notwithstanding all their distinctions, the worship of them is Idolatry.

Thus much I have thought good to add in this place (that I may not be less careful than he) for the preservation of our People from being deceived by those who mince this

this matter of *Image-worship*. Concerning which, I may truly say, as Dr. *Jackson* hath done, that *the Primitive Church abandon'd it, as the Liturgy of Hell.*

L.

That no man hath seen God in any form; and that therefore his Picture, or Image cannot be made.

Answer.

IN the First Edition of this Book, they condemned us for saying, *No man hath seen God at any time* (so well are they skilled in Scripture, where we find those very words, I. *John* 18.) but having been soundly lash'd for this foul Ignorance, by Bishop *Mountague*, now they have altered the words, they think, more wisely; tho still with a contradiction to St. *Paul*, who saith of God, that *no man hath seen him, nor can see him*: Which is as much, we think, as if he had said, *no man hath seen him in any form*, because his words import, that it is impossible one should see him at all.

From

From whence it is a plain consequence, that *his Picture, or Image, cannot be made.* And nothing but *stupid superstition*, that horrid blindness wherewith those are struck, who fall into Idolatry, could make any man affirm the contrary. Their Ancient *Schoolmen*, it is well known, absolutely condemn the making any Picture of God; but only, as in Christ he took upon him our Nature. Nay, the *Second* Council of *Nice* (as blockish as they were) had so much sense remaining, as to condemn the making of an Image of God, when they established the Worship of Images. And *John Damascen* himself saith, *it is the highest madness and impiety, to make any Figure of the Deity.* But time hath wrought mens minds into this Madness: and one would think a real frenzy possess'd this man, when he thought
III. Gen. 8. of the III. *Gen.* 8. (which only saith, *They heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden*) to prove God hath been seen in a Corporal form: As if *hearing* were *seeing*; or one could paint the form of a *sound*, or of *motion*. To what Impiety may not such men arrive, who can satisfy themselves with such Arguments?

XXVIII. Gen. 12. Nor is there the least mention of *any form*, wherein the Lord appeared to *Jacob*,

XXVIII.

XXVIII. *Gen.* 12. But if there had, it would be the higheſt impiety to call that *the picture of God*, who hath no form, no ſhape, no figure, or lineaments; and therefore cannot be Painted.

God ſpeaking to *Moſes face to face* XXXII. XXXII. *Exod.* 11. doth not imply God to Exod. 11. have a face; but only that he ſpake moſt familiarly to him, as one Friend ſpeaketh to another. His own *Menochius* goes farther; for his Interpretation is, *By an Angel appearing in corporeal and humane ſhape, God ſpake moſt familiarly to him.* And indeed it is the opinion of his Order (the *Jeſuits*) and of all later Divines in the *Roman* Church, very few excepted, that *God never appeared, but by the Miniſtry of Angels.*

Which anſwers what he alledgeth out of VII. *Dan.* 9 To which *Menochius* alſo gives VII. Dan. this farther ſatisfaction, *That every thing* 9. *which is here attributed unto God, ſignifies only the ſplendor of the Divine Majeſty; which, in one word, may be called Glory.* This is the only thing that can be repreſented; which it is impoſſible for any one to deſcribe.

As for VI. *Iſa.* 1, 5. 1 *Kings* XXII. 19. There is not the leaſt ſignification of any form wherein the *Divine Majeſty* appeared. His reaſonings upon theſe Texts are ſo weak,

weak, that they are not worthy any ones notice: But leſt he ſhould be wiſe in his own conceit, let him take this rational account from *Abulenſis*, an Author of his own Church, why no Image of the Trinity ſhould be made. *Firſt, For fear of Idolatry, leſt the Image it ſelf ſhould be worſhipped.* 2dly. *For fear of Error and Hereſy; in attributing to God corporiety and eſſential differences, ſuch as we ſee thoſe Three Figures repreſent.* This is ſufficient to convince any man, who is not *drunk with the cup of fornication*, mentioned by St. *John* in the *Revelation.*

We hear not a word of Fathers to countenance this Doctrine, which is a ſhrow'd ſign it is ſo far from being Ancient, that they ſpeak directly againſt it. And it is obſervable, that they bring in the *Gentiles* excuſing their making Images of their Gods, juſt as the *Papiſts* now excuſe themſelves, and as this man argues: That *Images were unto men, inſtead of writings* (or Scriptures) *upon which fixing their ſight, they might have ſome Conceptions of God.* They are the words of *Athanaſius* in his *Oration againſt the Gentiles.* And ſo *Euſebius* tells us, *Porphyry* ſaid, That *men by Statues, as by Books, have learnt to know the Doctrine of the Gods.* Behold the *Fathers* whom they follow. Thus the

Sworn

Sworn Enemies of *Jesus* Christ were wont to discourse.

LI.

That Blessing, or Signing with the sign of the Cross, is not founded in Holy Scripture.

Answer.

IT is uncertain, what he means by this proposition; whether he make *Blessing*, and *Signing with the sign of the Cross*, Two several things, or the same. If he mean that we say, Blessing things or Persons is not founded in Scripture, he is a notorious Calumniator; for we Bless our Children and our Meat. But if he mean, That *Blessing by Signing with the sign of the Cross* is not founded there, he saith true; for we find no Precept or Example for *such a way of Blessing*. Anciently indeed, when the Cross of Christ was *counted foolishness*, Christians used to sign themselves in the Forehead with this sign, in token that they gloried in the Death of Christ; which was nothing else, but to make

make a confession of their Faith, and to testify in what esteem they had Christ Crucified. The use of the sign upon such an occasion is not to be condemned, nor the use of it in their Benedictions: Whereby they declared their Belief, that they and all they had was Blessed by Christ, who was *made a curse for us*; and that through his Death and Passion (of which the *Cross* was a Memorial) they expected all manner of Blessings from God. But all this was of Humane Institution; for which we find no directions in Scripture.

None of the places he alledgeth, say a syllable of it; much less expressly mention this sign; Let the Reader look as long as he pleaseth into VII. *Rev.* 3. he will find no more, but that the Angel was commanded to *Seal* the servants of God in their Foreheads; With what mark we are not told.

VII. Rev. 3.

In the X. *Mark* 16. and XXIV. *Luke* 50. we read of Christ's blessing the Children that were brought to him; and of blessing his Disciples; but nothing of signing either with the Cross, or any thing else; which therefore is not founded in these, or indeed in any other Scriptures.

The

The Fathers, we know, speak of the use of the Sign of the Cross upon several occasions; but do they say it *was founded in Scripture?* Not a word of that, which is the only point. And *signing with the Cross* may be laid aside now, as many other Rites have been; which were no less in use in Ancient times, than that was; particularly, the Custom of *Praying Standing*, not *Kneeling* on the *Lords-day* and every day between *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*. Which was decreed in the famous Council of *Nice*; and as it had been in use before, and not then introduced, but only confirmed, so continued in the Church for 800 years; and yet is now quite disused. I say nothing of the *Spiritual Virtue*, as well as *Bodily Protection*, which they in the *Roman* Church, now expect from the *Sign of the Cross*; for which there is not either Scripture, or other Ancient Authority.

LII.

That the Publick Service of the Church, ought not to be said, but in a Language that all the People may understand.

Answer.

IT is some satisfaction that we shall part fairly; for in Conclusion he speaks truly and plainly. This is our Doctrine, which is so agreeable to the express words of the Bible; that unless the Bible contradict it self, nothing can be found there to the contrary.

1 Luke 8. St. *Luke* I. 8. saith nothing of any words the Priest spake, when he ministred *in the Sanctuary*. Nor do we find in the Bible, the least mention of Publick Prayers he made there, but only of *burning Incense*; which the People well understood represented the going up of their Prayers to God with acceptance; which they made *without*, while he burnt Incense *within*. Which may be called a *Symbolical Prayer*; the meaning of which was as well understood by the People, as what they themselves spake.

ſpake. The Angel indeed tells him, *v.* 13. *thy Prayer is heard*; but this doth not prove he ſpake any words, but rather lifted up his mind to God, when the Incenſe aſcended towards Heaven. For it is manifeſt he continued his Miniſtration after he was ſtruck Dumb; and therefore it was not the Cuſtom to ſpeak any words. But ſuppoſe he did, how doth it appear he did not ſpeak in the Language he uſed at other times, the Language of the Country? Tho it is not material whether he did or no; for the People were not in a Capacity to hear his Voice. And therefore this place, if it prove any thing, proves too much; that the Publick Service of the Church may be ſaid in a place ſeparate from all the People, where they can neither hear, nor ſee the Prieſt.

The XVI. *Levit.* 17. is moſt abſurdly alledged to ſerve this purpoſe, becauſe it ſpeaks of a *Typical Service* in the moſt Holy Place; unto which we have nothing here anſwerable upon Earth, but is fulfilling in the Interceſſion which our Lord Jeſus Chriſt makes for us continually in Heaven, by virtue of his moſt precious Blood, wherewith he entred in thither. Beſides, the High-Prieſt of old, ſaid not one word while he XVI. Lev. 17.

ſtaid there; and therefore this can be no argument the People need not underſtand the Publick Prayers of the Church, which are made, not in ſuch a Secret Place as that was, but openly in the hearing of all the People. Who, by this reaſoning, may be ſhut out of the Church, as well as excluded from underſtanding the Prayers, and the Prieſt left there to a ſilent Service by himſelf.

Here *Fathers* being wanting (for they are all againſt a Service in an unknown Tongue) he pretends he hath no need of them; tho he needleſly heapt them up, where he could find a word, that ſeemed to look that way he would have it. But he ſupplies this want with a bold untruth, That the *practice of the whole Chriſtian World, for theſe many hundred years hath been againſt us*, who would have Divine Service in a Language the People underſtand: Which can be ſalved by nothing, but by another proud falſity, that the *Roman Church* is the whole Chriſtian World. For no Church uſes *Latin Service*, but ſuch as are under the Dominion of the Pope of *Rome*; all others uſe the Language of their ſeveral Countries. Nay, there are ſome who have acknowledged his Authority, that

that would still have the Publick Service in their own Language, which the People understood.

For shame, let these men leave off Writing, and betake themselves to their Prayers, that God would forgive them their abominable Falshoods, wherewith they have laboured to maintain their Cause; particularly in this point, about Publick Service in a Language the People do not understand. Which they are sensible is against the expres Doctrine of St. *Paul*, in 1 *Cor.* XIV. and therefore this man thinks himself concern'd to attempt an Answer unto what we alledge from hence.

At *first* he distinguishes between *Publick* Prayer and *Private*, which here is very idle, for it is evident, the Apostle speaks of Publick Prayers *in the Church*, verse 19. *When the whole Church came together in one place*, verse 23.

Secondly, He saith this place is against us, because it proves the *Common Service of the Church, was not then in a Tongue which every man understood, but in another Language, not so common to all*, verse 16. Mark, how he contradicts himself; before he supposed (or else he talk'd impertinently) that the

Apostle discourses of *Private Prayers*; now he acknowledges it is *the Common Service of the Church*, of which he speaks, but shews it was not in the *Common Language*. What a brow have these men, who can thus out-face the clearest truth? That which the Apostle condemns as a fault of some Persons, and condemns as utterly inconsistent with the very end of Speech, as well as with the Edification of the Church; this man makes to have been common allowed Practice. Was there ever such Prevarication? A man had better have no use of Reason, than Discourse on this fashion; no Tongue at all, than talk at this rate, expressly against the Apostle's Injunction, who requires him, who could not deliver what he spake in a known Tongue, or had no Interpreter, *To hold his peace, and speak to himself, and to God*, v. 28.

His Argument to justify their Practice is so silly, that it cannot but make a good man sigh deeply, to think that poor ignorant People should be misled by such Ideots. For he takes him, *who occupied the place of the unlearned* (in verse 16.) to be one, who was required, or supposed to be there, to supply the unlearned man's place,

place, *That is*, saith he, *one who should have further understanding of that Tongue in which the Service of the Church is said.* Which he imagines is a proof, the Service was not in the Vulgar Tongue, for then there had been no need of one to supply the Ideots place, *&c.* This is such a grosse piece of *Duncery*, as his Master *Bellarmine* would have corrected, if he had look'd into him, or any of the Ancient and Modern Interpreters: Who by one that *takes up the place of the Unlearned*, do not understand, one that *acts in the stead of an Unlearned Person*, (that's a dull fancy, never heard of among the Learned) but *one that sits in the Place* or *Bench*, is *in the Form*, as we speak, *of the Unlearned.* That is, an *Ignorant Person*, who is the man that the Apostle saith, could not say, *Amen*, if he understood not what was said in the Thanksgiving. So *Menochius* upon that Text, *He* that sits among the Simple and Rude, who are *ignorant of Tongues*, how shall he say, *Amen?* That is, *approve thy Prayer, if he do not understand it.*

His Cavil therefore at the *Geneva* Ministers is foolish, if not malicious; for they translate the words honestly, not deceitfully, according to the certain sense of

them; there being no difference between an *Ideot*, and he *who supplies the place of an Ideot*.

We know of no Reformed Churches, where they do not say *Amen* to their Publick Prayers. Here we are sure the People are enjoyned so to do. Therefore it is another Slander, if he object this to us, who have not turned *Amen* into *So be it*, as he says many of the Reformed Churches have done. If it be true, that any have expounded the word, into others of like signification, it was for the Edification of the People, and no body hath just reason to find fault with them, if the People did not understand its meaning. Which they did in *Greece*, as much as in *Judea*, and therefore the Apostle had reason to retain it.

But he belies St. *Austin*, as he hath done us, when he makes him say, *It is not lawful to turn* Amen *into any other language, without the scandal of the whole Church.* For he saith,

* *L. 2, de Doct. Christ. c. 10.*

'* There is such variety of *Latin* Interpre-
'ters of the Scripture, as makes the know-
'ledge of the *Hebrew* and *Greek* necessary;
'that when one doubts of the *Latin*, re-
'course may be had thither; (this is worth
'marking for other purposes). Tho some

'*Hebrew*

'*Hebrew* words indeed we often find are 'not interpreted, as *Amen*, *Allelujah*, *Ra-'cha*, and *Oſanna*, &c. Which Antiquity 'hath preſerved, partly, *for the more ſacred 'Authority, tho they might have been interpret-'ed* (obſerve that) as *Amen*, and *Allelu-'jah*; partly, becauſe it's ſaid they cannot 'be tranſlated into another tongue, as the 'two other words, *Racha*, and *Oſanna*. In which diſcourſe he ſays nothing of the unlawfulneſs of Tranſlating the *Hebrew* words, nor of the ſcandal their Tranſlation would give; but only of ſome of them, particularly, *Amen*, being more venerable in the Original Language, than in any other. What he ſays in his *Epiſtles* I cannot ſtand to examine; for in that *Epiſtle* which he quotes, there is nothing to be found about this matter.

In concluſion, he is driven to this ſhift, to ſay, That our own Service is not underſtood, becauſe it conſiſts partly of the *Pſalms of David* (which he moſt falſly ſays are *the hardeſt part of all the Bible*) and of *Leſſons* out of the *Old and New Teſtament*, which are not underſtood by the people. But is this all that our Service conſiſts of? Have we not *Prayers* and *Thanksgivings*, eaſie to be underſtood every word? As in the other

other part of the Service they understand enough for their Edification; whereas of their *Mass*, the simple people understand nothing: Or suppose they understand a little, yet this will not make their case like ours; because the people with us have all in their vulgar Language, tho they do not every one understand all; but they have not a word in their vulgar language, tho some perhaps may understand a little of the *Latin* Tongue.

And what is the reason they dare not trust the *Mass* in the vulgar language? Because it is hard to be understood? No, but quite contrary, because the people would easily find things there which confute their own Religion, and are conformable unto ours. For who would believe *Purgatory* any longer, who heard the Priest say in the vulgar tongue, *Lord, remember thy servants and handmaids that are gone before us, with the sign of Faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace*? If they be *in peace*, every one would be ready to say, Then they are not *burning in the Purgatory-fire*; and what need I give my money to Pray them out from thence? The like passages there are, that would make them believe *Transubstantiation* to be a Fable; and that it is a novel thing to have

the

the Divine Service in an *Unknown Tongue*; which I have not room to mention: But desire the Reader to observe how this practice is condemned out of the mouths of many great persons in their own Church. I will name *Two*.

One is Cardinal *Cajetan*, upon 1 *Cor.* XIV. who saith, Out of this Doctrine of *Paul* we learn, *That it is better for the Edification of the Church, that the Publick Prayers which are said in the audience of the people, should be said in the tongue common to Clerks and People, than said in* Latin. A most ingenuous Confession; in which he doth but follow one of their *Saints*, viz. *Anselm*, in his Exposition of the same Chapter; *That is good which thou sayest, but another is not edified by thy words, which he understands not. Therefore since you meet in the Church for Edification, those things ought to be said in the Church, which may be understood by men, and afford Edification to the hearers.*

CONCLUSION.

NOW I leave all men, who have a grain of common sense and common honesty, whether this man, who (both in the

the *Title* and *Conclusion* of his Book) pretends to *judge us out of our own mouth*, be not, as St. *James* speaks, a *judge of evil thoughts*: That is, as his *Menochius* expounds it, *one who reasons ill, and therefore judgeth ill*: *Who desiring to be a Teacher of others, understands neither what he saith, nor whereof he affirms.* As will be confessed by all who follow our Saviour's Rule,

II. Jam. 4.

1 Tim. I. 7.

VII. John 24.

Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Page 38. *line* 20. *r.* to become.
P. 54. *l.* 26. *r.* of Religion.
P. 90. *l.* 24. *r.* all together.
P. 105. *l.* 1. *r.* Arts; whereby.
P. 145. *l.* 24. *r.* 1 Cor. IX. 27.
P. 172. *l.* 25. *r.* heard of, much less have ever seen.
P. 184. *l.* 5. *r.* Rich Man.
P. 187. *l.* 14. *r.* ad Pop. Antioch.
P. 193. *l.* 21. *r.* things done at.
P. 207. *l.* 15. *r.* solemn Rite.
P. 213. *l.* 6. *r.* most suitable.
P. 217. *l.* 16. *r.* ~~*Tert. Sum.*~~
Ibid. l. 17. *r.* mere impudence.
P. 218. *l.* 1. *r.* *Bona* for *Bonell.*
P. 224. *l.* 21. *r.* S. Victore.
P. 231. *l.* 21. *r.* speaking of Virgins.
P. 250. *l. antepenult. r.* visible.
P. 253. *l.* 11. *r.* God's footstool.
P. 262. *l.* 14. *r.* of Fathers to countenance.